

1182

THE NONCONFORMIST

1183

THE NONCONFORMIST.

"The dissidence of dissent and the protestantism of the protestant religion."

No. 21.

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1841.

PRICE 6d.

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

MONOPOLY SANCTIONED AND ABETTED BY A STATE-CHURCH.

AN invasion of the rights of all for the special advantage of a favoured few, whilst it may be speciously defended by reasons grounded upon temporary expediency, has never, so far as we are aware, been justified by any reference to the immutable principles of Christian morality. The fruits of monopoly, however, have not hitherto been such as to recommend the cultivation of the tree. That which begins in robbery can hardly be expected to work out a blessing. Infractions of the eternal rules of justice, whether perpetrated by individuals or by states, have always in the long run proved to be impolitic—so that even experience gives judgment against monopoly. But just in proportion as we apply higher standards of right and wrong, and test monopolies by the decisions of our moral sense and the dictates of revealed truth, just in the same proportion doubts and uncertainties clear off; and the thing which was known to be barely tolerable stands out before us in hideous deformity. Of all principles of policy, monopoly can the least afford to bear the light.

Monopoly is the conversion of *tuum* into *meum* by a legal act of simple unmixed injustice. It is essentially privative. It confers nothing—it only takes away. It gives no right—it merely places right in abeyance. It would be well if this feature of it were thoroughly understood. Too commonly it is regarded as somewhat given to a few, which in fairness should be given to all. It is nothing of the sort. It is a somewhat which all possess of natural right taken away from the mass, that the right left in the hands of a few may have a factitious value. It is not a crop raised on a certain spot whilst all the rest of the field is left bare, but a crop previously existing mowed down in all parts of the field except a little circle capriciously marked out. Monopoly is defined "the exclusive right of selling a thing;" but the right to sell that which is mine—in other words to exchange it for that which is yours, both parties consenting—is possessed antecedently to government; and, to render it exclusive, either my right or your's must be taken away. The power which creates monopoly must do so by practising injustice. There is no way to privilege but over the mangled remains of right.

The whole spirit, the direct precepts, and, we may add, the early practice of Christianity are dead against monopoly. "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," and "Look not every man on his own things but every man also on the things of others," constitute a two-edged sword which cuts asunder all exclusive pretensions. And if in the morning purity of the church, men voluntarily held all things in common, and no man called aught that he possessed his own, one can hardly see how the same system could sanction the destruction of a common right with a view to individual advantage.

A state-church is a monopoly—a monopoly of the worst kind, the abettor of all other monopolies, how abominable soever.

The history of the church of England is one of the most curious, one of the most instructive, and one of the most humiliating illustrations of the hateful principle we have attempted briefly to describe. It is the history of a conflict between monopoly and light, in which the former, sorely against its nature, has been compelled by the latter to surrender several of its most preposterous pretensions. In the palmy days of her power, the church arrogated to herself the exclusive right of determining what should be the nation's faith, and denied the exercise of private judgment. This usurpation having been wrested from her—not without a deadly struggle—she still claimed as her sole prerogative, the privilege of teaching. Losing this, she strenuously laboured, and laboured successfully for upwards of a century, to withhold from persons not of her communion civil enjoyments to which they were entitled. And until this day, she assumes power to tax directly or indirectly every subject of the realm for her maintenance and support. Every step here tramples upon some right common to all men—and, whatever may be the ostensible purpose, the real one is to destroy what belongs to the many, in order that the value of that which remains with the few may be enhanced.

Like sympathises with like. The church which set the example of cutting down the rights of others, with a view to a selfish advantage, could never pretend to condemn monopoly in principle. She sees in it nothing but a reflection of her own features, and she is

not likely to start back with affright. Others may deem the thing a monster, but the church cannot. Hatred of monopoly would be hatred of herself. This were unnatural. This or that modification of the principles she may condemn—but against the principle itself she cannot lift her voice, for

"Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?"

And what the likelihood of the thing would lead us to anticipate, facts abundantly confirm. The monopolies of James and Charles, cruel as they were, the state-church was forward enough to abet, by licking the feet of the tyrants, and furnishing some pretended divine prescription for all their fooleries and all their crimes. The monopoly of legislation is mainly upheld by the influence of the establishment. She shakes hands with the food-monopoly, and openly avows the intimate connection between restrictive corn laws and her own prosperity. Against slavery, the monopoly of human thews and sinews, of human hearts and heads, she never protested, but sullenly stood aloof from agitation, and everywhere whispered calumny against the chief agitators.

This, indeed, is one of the gravest political objections which lie against a civil establishment of religion—that by a natural law, a law springing out of its very constitution, its influence has been, and always will be exerted on the side of whatever is narrow and exclusive, whatever trespasses upon the common and inalienable rights of human nature. In all ages of our country's history the state-church has proved the most powerful bulwark of monopoly—never, perhaps, more offensively so than in the present day. No considerations of danger, no promptings of humanity, no compassion for pining myriads can avail to draw from her a single word in disapprobation of our existing corn laws. She is still found the active friend of those who range themselves against the liberties and the happiness of the people. The large majority of determined monopolists returned to parliament at the last election has been ascribed, and we think justly, to the overwhelming influence of the church. Any advance to a more liberal system of government must be effected in the face of her active, organised, and powerful opposition. So long as she remains, monopoly will not want an earnest and too efficient ally. Herself an embodiment of injustice she can always sympathise with injustice. In the fall of secular monopolies she reads her own approaching doom.

PROPOSED DAY FOR HUMILIATION AND PRAYER.

AT the national Conference of Christian ministers held at Manchester to consider the question of the present corn laws, the following resolution among others was unanimously adopted:

"That this Conference earnestly recommends to all who may approve it, to set apart Monday, the 6th of September, as a day for humiliation before Almighty God, on account of our sins; and for solemn prayer, that it might please him in his superintending providence to remove the distresses which at this time afflict the country, and which especially bow down the hearts of the suffering poor; to revive trade and commerce in the land; and to endow our senators at this important crisis with the wisdom which is probable to direct."

Not many weeks since we deemed it our duty to comment in terms of some severity, upon the authoritative appointment by the Scottish kirk of a day for fasting, humiliation, and prayer. Our objection was twofold. The occasion for such a proceeding was nothing more than the perplexities in which a priesthood were involved, by retaining state-pay without submitting to state-control, and the tone in which the obligation was laid upon the church was far beyond apostolical in the peremptoriness of the commands.

We are happy in being able to recommend with all cordiality a similar proceeding, occasioned by much graver considerations, and brought under the notice of our churches in quite another spirit: Nothing can be more delicate, nothing can tacitly disclaim with more effect all right to dictate, than the resolution to which we have given insertion above; and with all earnestness we beg to use the little influence we may possess to induce a general compliance by dissenting churches with the invitation of their assembled brethren.

We do so for many reasons.

First, we are unfashionable enough to believe in the efficacy of sincere prayer.

We think, in the next place, that solemn and devout supplication to the Almighty to remove the distresses which prey upon and literally consume our poorer fellow countrymen, a most powerful means to awaken right feeling, to give additional intensity to com-

passion, and to nerve resolution on the subject of the wide-spread misery which now afflicts the land.

It will, further, allow many who did not attend the conference, whether from necessity or from disapprobation, to prove that they are nevertheless keenly alive to the sufferings of the industrious classes, and sincerely anxious to see them permanently relieved.

Nor must we leave out of consideration the moral effect which cannot fail of being produced by the spectacle of several thousand churches in our country, of their own will, and not swayed by authority, bowing down in all solemnity to supplicate the bountiful Creator and universal Ruler that all hindrances, whatever they may be, may be taken out of the way, which prevent his creatures in these realms from obtaining and enjoying "daily bread."

We might enlarge, but we deem it unnecessary. Those who objected to a clerical conference cannot, surely, object to prayer. They have oftentimes complied with the commands of the state in a matter like the present. They will not refuse now to comply with the invitation of their brethren.

THE CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS ECCLESIASTICAL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

VI. Impugners of the rites and ceremonies established in the church of England censured.

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the church of England by law established are wicked, antichristian, or superstitious, or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and godly affected may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, or as occasion requireth subscribe unto them, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors.

VII. Impugners of the government of the church of England by archbishops, bishops, &c., censured.

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the government of the church of England under his majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian and repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and so continue until he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors.

A meeting of rate payers of the parish of St. Martin, Leicester, was held in the parish church on Friday last, to lay a church-rate for the coming year. The vicarship being, we believe, in abeyance, it devolved on the meeting to elect a chairman, and the sons of the church militant appropriately made choice of Mr. John David Jackson, a subordinate officer in the Leicestershire Yeomanry Cavalry. Mr. Churchwarden Eames asked for a rate of 3d. in the pound; and Mr. Ex-churchwarden Moxon seconded the motion. The Rev. T. Stevenson, (general Baptist minister) said—Mr. Chairman, before the motion is put, I wish to say a few words upon it. I do so with great reluctance; and only because I feel it to be my duty. Most of you are aware that I and others have been exposed to persecution, some of us in the ecclesiastical courts and others by the seizure of their goods, for a conscientious opposition to the payment of church rates. I am reluctant to say anything to offend any person; but unless we are treated a little more fairly, what opinion can we form of our opponents? Mr. Moxon,—who, I must say behaved to me in the most gentlemanly manner—told me that it was unpleasant to him and he wished the law was altered; but it was his duty, and, while the law existed, he must enforce it. Now I am of opinion, and it is a pretty general one, that there is no law until you make one. If you pass a rate, you pass a law to make dissenters pay it; but there is no law to compel you to pass it. I have but little property, yet I would rather part with half of it, than I would pay a church rate (hear, hear). I think it would be wrong in me to do so; and on that account, I should refuse. After this avowal, on my own behalf and on behalf of a number of others, I think it will be ungentlemanly and unchristian if you pass a law to compel us to pay that of which we conscientiously disapprove. You recognise the respectability of dissenters in other matters, you put them into offices of trust in the parish—and therefore if you do not give them credit for sincerity in this matter, what is it but persecution? I am, as some of you know, a dissenting minister; and our salaries are little enough for what we do. There are gentlemen here who have given £50 each towards the erection of the place of worship with which I am connected; and it does appear to me unkind, ungenerous, unchristian, that they should be despoiled of their goods. They pay the expenses of their own chapels; [a voice—we do that with pleasure] and it does appear to me most unjust that they should also be called upon to support the established church. I make these remarks in the spirit of candour. I ask you, before you pass a rate, to pause two or three minutes. Do consider the influence which it will have. I speak the sentiments of a number of persons. We assert that there is no law which compels you to inflict a rate upon us; it is you who do it, and you do it deliberately. Mr. Shardlow then moved that the consideration of this question be adjourned for six months. Mr. Joseph Nunneley seconded the motion. Dr. Shaw said the churchwardens were bound by law to make a rate, whether the parish consented or not. That had been decided by the Braintree case. Mr. W. Baines asked where could the law be found. It was only a suggestion thrown out by a judge. There was no law to compel the making of a rate. The Chairman positively refused to put the amendment. The dissenters then retired in a body, declining to vote, amid the sneers of their opponents, who passed the rate, and the meeting broke up.

It will be recollected by our readers, that on the 22nd ult., a meeting was held in the church in Barrow-upon-Soar, to consider the propriety of making a church-rate, and that an adjournment for twelve months was agreed to. Not satisfied with this decision, the church party called another meeting on the 19th instant, when the vicar again took the chair. The dissenters objected to this second meeting as illegal, the question having been decided at the former one. This objection, however, was disregarded, and a rate of twopence in the pound was proposed and seconded, when others of the dissenting party, resolving to remove all pretence for quibbling, proposed and seconded an amendment for an adjournment for twelve months. The chairman refused

to put the amendment in the usual way, and contented himself with putting the rate "Yes or No," when he had the mortification to discover that while there were only eight for the rate, including himself, the curate, and the two churchwardens, there were fourteen in opposition to it.—*Leicestershire Mercury*.

A meeting of the rate-payers of Wakefield was convened by the churchwardens, for the purpose of laying a rate for the repairs of the parish church, on Thursday last. About half-past twelve the vicar having taken the chair, the business commenced by George Craven, Esq. protesting against the legality of the notice and moving an adjournment, which was seconded; but the vicar refusing to put the motion, Mr. S. Stattar proposed, and Mr. Cowell seconded, a rate of twopence in the pound on the rate-payers of Wakefield, and three halfpence in the pound on those of the out-townships. Mr. Craven then moved an amendment, "that no rate whatever be granted for the ensuing year," which was seconded by Mr. John Clarkson, and being put to the meeting was carried by a large majority. The proposition "for the rate" was put separately, when again the great majority of the hands appeared against it. The vicar now addressed the meeting, declaring his intention of remaining until the business for which they were convened was done—namely, a rate of some sort laid; but Mr. Craven determined not to submit to any compromise, but fight the battle fairly—"rate or no rate." After numerous suggestions for an amicable arrangement, all of which met with opposition, the churchwardens demanded a poll on their original motion, which the vicar, as chairman, having granted, Mr. Craven told them that whatever further proceedings were taken must be at their own expense, and after some hesitation and evasion they were obliged to agree. It was now proposed and seconded that the votes be taken by ballot, which of course met with opposition from the few tories present, but, being put to the meeting, was carried almost unanimously, only three or four hands being held up against it. This terminated the business of the meeting, which was declared adjourned to Monday.

At Shepton Mallet, the church-rate party has secured a temporary triumph by means of a very subtle device. Notice was given on a Sunday for the holding of a meeting, at a very unusual hour on a subsequent day, to consider the question of a rate; and on the arrival of that day, the pro-rate party, calculating by the London time (which the difference of longitude makes considerably in advance of that of Shepton Mallet), met together, and succeeded in carrying a rate of sixpence in the pound before their opponents could assemble.

At Low Harrogate, on Thursday the 12th ult., a rate was proposed in vestry, for and against which the votes of the rate-payers were found exactly balanced, and it was then carried by the casting-vote of the clergyman in the chair. It appeared afterwards that the seconder of the motion for this rate was an unqualified person, and that the rate was therefore informal. On the ensuing Thursday, to which the proceedings were adjourned, the proposal for a rate of twopence in the pound was negatived by a vote of nearly eleven to one of the numbers polled. The minister is said to have been greatly incensed and to have threatened ecclesiastical proceedings.

Last week the question respecting Headcorn church rates came before the magistrates at the Bearsted petty sessions, Kent. Three of the principal rate-payers were summoned before them for the church rate, said to be made on the 7th of May last. The churchwardens produced the vestry book, the monition, and the rate book, and gave the necessary evidence as to how the rate was made, their having properly demanded it, the refusal to pay, &c. It appeared that the vestry had been called under a monition issued from the Court of Arches, that at the vestry the churchwardens moved and seconded a rate of 9d. in the pound, that an amendment was proposed, seconded, and put to the meeting, proposing for the churchwardens to accept a voluntary subscription, that the amendment was carried by a majority of 33 to 14, that the chairman called upon the churchwardens and others with them to make a rate, and they then proceeded to make the rate in question of 9d. in the pound. The defendants declined to make any legal objection to the validity of the rate, but left that entirely in the hands of the magistrates. The magistrates then consulted together, after which the clerk stated that as no legal objection was offered to the rate, an order for the payment thereof would be made, and if that was not attended to, warrants of distress would follow.—*Chelmsford Chronicle*.

During the past week the churchwardens of Burslem, (Staffordshire Potteries,) Messrs. George Baker, Joseph Alcock, Thomas Brindley, and William Edge, have distrained upon three respectable dissenters for church-rates, viz., Mr. John Maddock, earthenware manufacturer, Mr. Joseph Hall, merchant, and Mr. W. S. Kennedy, proprietor of the *N. S. Mercury*. Mr. Hall is a baptist; Messrs. Maddock and Kennedy are independents. The proceedings have produced a feeling of deep disgust, especially the fact that Edge, one of the churchwardens, is a Wesleyan! The articles taken, which consisted of a mahogany table, Mitchell's splendid map of the United States, and a quantity of printers' flannel, were sold by private contract, at the Town-hall on Monday last, for six pounds. The liberal party determined on purchasing the whole and presenting them to the owners at a public dinner, which was given to these gentlemen at Burslem yesterday. As soon as the goods were bought they were carried on the shoulders of men round the town, accompanied by music and the liberal colours. We shall notice the dinner proceedings next week.

At a public dinner at Cheltenham the other day, Lord Segrave related the following anecdote:—"A friend of mine in the House of Commons requested me to present a petition to the House of Lords, from a parish in his neighbourhood, against church-rates; and among other allegations in the petition, they stated that one year one of the items in the churchwarden's account was twenty pounds for—what do you suppose? Not for repairs and decorations to the church, but for killing sparrows. The petitioners prayed for an investigation into the accuracy of their statement. I presented their petition, and stated this fact; and though there were some right reverend prelates on the bench, the statement was neither denied nor inquiry proposed. Now I cannot bring myself to believe that a cock sparrow is so formidable an enemy as to warrant the application of rates from the pockets of the people, for churchwardens to wage so expensive a war on them."



IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS FOR THE WEEK.

Church Extension, for, 2.
Corn Laws, for repeal of, 18.
—against repeal of, 21.
Import Duties, for alteration of, 1.
Universal Suffrage, for, 461.

PUBLIC BUSINESS TRANSACTED.

MOTIONS.

Lords Commissioners' speech—Motion made and question proposed, "That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, to offer our humble thanks for her Majesty's most gracious speech." [The address was as usual an echo of the speech.] Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "last parliament" to the end of the question, in order to add the words, "Humbly to represent to her Majesty that we observe with great concern that the public expenditure has of late in each of several successive years exceeded the annual income, and that we are convinced of the necessity of adopting measures for the purpose of remedying so great an evil:

"To assure her Majesty that we are deeply sensible of the importance of those considerations to which her Majesty has been graciously pleased to direct our attention, in reference to the commerce and revenue of the country, and to the laws which regulate the trade in corn:

"That in deciding on the course which it may be advisable to pursue with reference to matters of such importance, it will be our earnest desire to consult the interests and promote the welfare of all classes of her Majesty's subjects; that we feel it, however, to be our duty humbly to submit to her Majesty, that it is essential to the satisfactory result of our deliberations on these and other matters of public concern, that her Majesty's government should possess the confidence of this House and of the country, and respectfully to represent to her Majesty that that confidence is not reposed in the present advisers of her Majesty:

"To assure her Majesty, that in the gracious expression of her Majesty's deep sympathy with those of her subjects who are now suffering from distress and want of employment, we recognise an additional proof of her Majesty's tender regard for the welfare of her subjects, and that we cordially join in the prayer of her Majesty, that all our deliberations may be guided by wisdom, and may conduce to the happiness of her people," instead thereof.—(Mr. Stuart Wortley.) The House divided; ayes 360, noes 289.

Address read a second time:—Amendment proposed, to add at the end thereof the words, "That we further respectfully represent to your Majesty, that, in our opinion, the distress which your Majesty deplores is mainly attributable to the circumstance of your whole people not being fully and fairly represented in this House; and that we feel it will be our duty to consider the means of so extending and regulating the suffrage, and of adopting such improvements in the system of voting, as will confer on the working classes that just weight in the representative body which is necessary to secure a due consideration of their interests, and which their present patient endurance of suffering gives them the strongest title to claim."—(Mr. Sharman Crawford.) Ayes 39, noes 283.

BILLS PRESENTED, AND READ A FIRST TIME.

1. Outlawries bill.
2. Navy Pay bill.

BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

1. Navy Pay bill.

DEBATES.

Tuesday, Aug. 24.

The SPEAKER having read from the chair the speech delivered in the other house by the lords commissioners.

MR. MARK PHILLIPS rose to move an address in consonance with it. In advertizing to our foreign relations, as indicated in the speech, he declared the great satisfaction which, as the representative of a great manufacturing constituency, he felt at restoration of pacific dispositions throughout Europe, and expressed his hope that the dispute with China would be adjusted on a footing of general advantage to British commerce. He trusted that the House would adopt the recommendation in the speech for a careful examination of the present customs' duties. Much complaint had been made of the opinions advanced in the report of last year's committee upon imports; but none of the objectors had attempted to correct those opinions by the appointment of another committee for the revision of the subject. He intimated his approbation of the proposals made by ministers respecting the sugar duties, and then proceeded to the great question of the corn laws. He represented the distress in the districts within his own knowledge to be now unusually severe, and called upon the members for other manufacturing constituencies to bear their testimony to the like effect. The people would not bear their sufferings patiently, while the monopoly occasioned by the present corn laws should continue unaltered. He had seen with disgust, in certain newspapers, an allegation that England would be no sufferer if the ploughshare were driven through the manufacturing districts. Those who threw out such opinions should remember, that but for the manufactures exported from England the articles of their own daily comfort would not be brought into the English market: they should remember that the interests of the manufacturing were also the interests of the agricultural classes. He referred to the evils inflicted on the monied and other interests by that general contraction of a paper currency convertible into gold which must needs ensue wherever gold was the only medium for the purchase of corn. He appealed to experience to show the general inutility of protections to the very classes for whose profit they were intended. He urged the patience with which the people had endured their sufferings; and, confidently appealing to the sympathy of the House, read the address which he had risen to propose, and which, as usual, adopted, *mutatis mutandis*, the language of the speech.

MR. JOHN DUNDAS seconded the address.

MR. JOHN STUART WORTLEY trusted that an excuse would be found for his making so early an address to the House, in the circumstances under which he had been returned to parliament, by a great body of that people of whom her Majesty had directed the recent inquiry to be made. It could not be otherwise than respectful, nay, it was due to the crown, to carry up at the earliest moment the answer which the people had commissioned their representatives to return to her Majesty's question. In proposing to do so, he was following the example which in 1835 was set by his predecessor, Lord Morpeth, and recommended in the address then made by Lord John Russell to his constituents. The question was now, whether a ministry circumstanced like the present government, were entitled to dictate the address of the House of Commons. The mover had attributed the existing distress solely to the rejection of the ministerial policy. But this was not the question of to-night: the House, before those topics should be argued, must decide what government was to deal with them. The present ministers had forfeited the confidence of the country by the pledges they had broken and the delusions they had attempted. The chief among them had been members of Lord Grey's

government, which had professed the great principles of peace, economy, and reform. They affected to have some conclusive secret for avoiding war. Now, in the fifteen years preceding their accession to power, the only act of war had been the accidental affair of Navarino; but in the ten years following their accession, the wars they engaged in, though little ones, were no fewer than five. Of their expenditure he would not complain: it might have been necessary; but what right had they to take credit for a superior saving, when they had increased, instead of diminishing, the burdens of the country? In their reforms they had certainly gone great lengths: but they had pushed their reforms in those directions only in which the tendency of them was to weaken the tories. They had boasted of governing without patronage; yet how had they lavished their places and their peerages! He then gave the history of their tergiversations on the subject of the appropriation clause, and on the items of this very budget—particularly on the sugar duty, as to which so lately as last year they had on principle resisted the alterations now so vehemently urged by themselves. He bore his testimony to the fortitude with which the people had endured their privations, and to their sagacity in detecting the delusive attempt made upon their understanding by a government advancing ministerial measures without ministerial power to carry them. If, however, there was in the principle of free trade something really valuable to the country, it would not be lost by the fall of this administration. What had been the conduct of Lord Melbourne on the corn laws? Only last year he had designated the idea of the now proposed change as absolute madness, and deprecated the scheme of a fixed duty as a movement that would stir up the very foundations of society. Mr. Wortley then observed upon the precarious state of our foreign relations, and noticed in language of astonishment the remarkable omission of all reference to our important discussions with the United States. Nor could he pass over the countenance given by the government to agitation, and its alliance with those who, while on one day they offer the most fulsome adulation to her Majesty, on the next are treasonably gloating over the prospect of foreign war for the promotion of their own political objects. A government of which all these things were true was no longer to be trusted with the management of public affairs; and he would now submit an amendment by which he would propose to express the regret of the House at the recent increase in the expenditure, its determination to provide for that increase, and its earnest desire to promote the welfare of her Majesty's subjects; and respectively represent to her Majesty the necessity that her ministers should enjoy the confidence of the country, which the present administration did not possess.

Lord BRUCE seconded the amendment.

MR. LABOUCHERE said that ministers were as glad as their opponents that the time had come for fully expounding their policy, and for quitting their position if that policy should be disapproved by the House. He admitted the course taken by the opposition to be a fair one; but he had listened in vain to learn what policy it was on which they were prepared to bestow their approbation. Much was said of the retention of office by the present ministers in the face of a manifest majority; but Sir Robert Peel had done the same thing in 1835, even after a defeat on the Speaker's election, and another on the address. Mr. Labouchere then claimed credit to Lord Grey's government for having done all that was possible, and under difficult circumstances, to fulfil their pledges of peace, economy, and reform. Happy would be the new ministers if, for the next ten years, the state of Europe should be as peaceful as for the last ten years it had been. As to economy, it was rather the province of opposition than of ministers to control expense: but ministers had conducted their expenses in the spirit of economy, which was all they had assumed to do. As to reforms, they had effected many in which they had no party object whatever; and he looked back to those reforms with feelings of unmixed satisfaction. In matters of commerce there had been but little of legislative reform from any ministry. Mr. Huskisson's reforms had been reluctantly permitted by his own adherents, but supported by the whigs, who always had refused, and he trusted always would, in or out of office, refuse to meet questions of commerce as questions of party. The difficulties which always beset commercial legislation had undoubtedly checked the whig ministers in this kind of reform. But they had at length resolved to bring the whole subject under the consideration of the House. He recapitulated the commercial measures introduced by them last spring, beginning with the bill for the relief of the West Indians from the old limitations of their markets, and proceeding to the proposals of alteration in the sugar duties and in the corn laws. On this last subject he professed himself unable to understand the views of those who brought forward the amendment; but if ever there was a time for revising these laws, it was the present. For some time past we had annually imported 1,500,000 quarters of corn; and it was idle, therefore, to talk about preserving ourselves in a state of independence of a foreign supply. Our imports of corn from Ireland, too, had been for some years on the decrease. He then commented severely on the fraud occasioned by the present mode of taking the averages—a fraud which he knew of no means to prevent, but by which the landed interests were deprived of their desired protection for the benefit, and at the pleasure, of speculators and gamblers. Whatever protection, therefore, the House might think fit to give, ought, in his opinion, to be given in the shape of a fixed duty; nor could he comprehend how a sliding scale, which was applicable to no other commerce, should be good for the trade in corn. But how were the deficiencies in the revenue to be supplied? Not, surely, by fresh taxation. He was himself persuaded that much might have been done for the relief of the people by the removal of various import duties; and he exemplified his opinion by some details. He then repeated the often-made call upon the opposite leaders to declare their own view of public policy, for the country would not be satisfied if the result of this debate should be a mere recommendation of a change of ministers, instead of an undertaking to consider the great questions referred by her Majesty to the House of Commons.

M. D'ISRAELI observed that Mr. Labouchere's parallel between Sir R. Peel's government and the present was defective in these respects—that no vote of want of confidence was recorded against Sir R. Peel; and that his dissolution made an unprecedented addition to his numbers. The ground which the people had taken in the late elections was, that the affairs of this country ought not to be left with a govern-

ment whose councils were held, not to deliberate upon public measures, but to devise the means of securing a majority. What had that government done since the vote denying to it the confidence of the House to justify the restoration of parliamentary support? They had proceeded to a dissolution, and the result of it proved that it had been either a blunder or a crime. They had profaned the name of the Queen at their elections, as if she had been a second candidate at some petty poll. It had been said, that the sovereign of a faction was the sovereign but of part of the people; but a whig sovereign would be the sovereign of not half, no, not an eighth of the people. The whigs ought to blush for the position in which they had placed their sovereign. Would they found their claims to confidence upon the speech this day delivered? It was a speech made by a set of men who continued, in some mysterious way, to be ministers still, though their leader himself, in his late letter to his constituents, had avowed that the majority of the House was opposed to his government.

Mr. BERNAL, jun., thought Mr. D'Israeli but little entitled to inveigh against the liberals, inasmuch as he had formerly been of their opinions. Mr. Bernal thought the corn law sought to have been remodeled before the present poor law was passed.

Sir C. NAPIER desired the opposition to remember that the wars waged by this government, if they had been little wars, had been wars of little expense, and productive of great results; those wars had given a free government to Spain, and had put down a gross tyranny in Syria.

Lord POLLINGTON admitted that the best part of the ministerial policy was the foreign; but thought that even as to this there was but too much ground for censure.

Mr. ROEBUCK declared that he should vote in favour of the amendment, but not for the reasons given by those who brought it forward; for his cause of dislike to the whigs was, that they too much resembled the tories. The present question would be, which party would serve the public best? and, in order to decide that, he would take a retrospect of the conduct of both. The whigs were now ruined; not, however, by the conservative feeling of the people, but by their own misconduct—by their stopping short in the reforms required of them, and they could recover their power only by a long virtuous course of opposition. It was unavailing for ministers to complain that they had been defeated by bribery and intimidation, for these were the natural incidents of the system which they had protected. Looking back for the last ten years, he found Sir R. Peel and his party opposing all reforms. The conservatives at the late elections had, moreover, basely and with every vulgar art endeavoured to gain favour by condemning the poor law, which their leader had supported, and their leader had not dared to rebuke them. Such were the merits of the two contending parties. The tories would now rule, for they represented the majority. It was the majority, indeed, of the constituencies, not of the people; but that was the fault of the ministers, who would not invest the people with the elective power. He then reviewed certain parts of the foreign policy of ministers. He condemned the war with China, and declared his entire approval of the conduct pursued by the American government in the affair of M'Leod, upon which he entered into a long disquisition.

Mr. MUNTZ said a few words in explanation of his own views as to the effect of corn laws upon wages.

Mr. EWART, at half-past 11, moved an adjournment, on which the gallery was cleared for a division. While strangers were excluded some conversation took place, in which Sir R. Peel, Lord J. Russell, and Mr. Banks expressed their disapprobation of the modern system of protracted debates; and the House finally adjourned without dividing.

Wednesday, Aug. 25.

Mr. EWART began by complaining that sympathy was not enough for the people; they asked for bread, and must not be put off with a stone. He admitted that the constituencies had decided against the existing government, and that it must now therefore make way for a new ministry; but he expected that Sir Robert Peel, as in the case of the catholic question, would himself do the very thing he had resisted; and, like Shakspere's apothecary, excuse himself by saying, "My poverty, but not my will, consents." He rejoiced that ministers had taken a course of liberal commercial policy, in which he and some friends of his had been the forlorn hope. Coming to the subject of the corn law, he quoted Sir Robert Peel, who in July, 1836, had told the farmers that they must rely upon their own exertions, and pointed to the farmers of Scotland for an example to them. The farmers of Scotland, indeed, in the use of important manures, recognised the alliance between commerce and agriculture. Mr. Ewart was convinced that agriculture would at last become a manufacture, or at least the subject of machinery. It was already a trade, and the measures proposed by government would give it advantages common to all trades, steadiness of demand and competition.

Captain HAMILTON desired to recall the House to the real question, which was that of confidence in the ministry.

Mr. WARD admitted that the election of the member who had moved the amendment was a great triumph to his party; but thought it also one of the greatest mistakes which had been made by the people. Members seemed to have two sets of opinions—one for the hustings and one for the House. The mover had presented himself to the West Riding as the champion of the corn laws; but in his speech to this House he had taken no notice whatever of that subject. There was another matter which he did not notice, that of the appropriation clause and its abandonment by the whigs: a bold argument from a supporter of that statesman who had so signally abandoned his own opinions on the other great Irish question, the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. For his own part, he blamed both Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel for not having resigned at once, rather than submit to take a course opposed to their former declarations; and both of them had suffered for the mistake. The harvest would soon neutralise the efforts of the new majority. His accounts led him to anticipate a woful deficiency, which would be seriously aggravated by a few more such days as that which had just closed [cries of "No!"]. Such at least were his accounts; perhaps they varied with each man's political wishes [indignant cheers from the opposition]. He did not wish to make the weather a party question; but he would have the House remember, that four millions sterling in gold must go out of the country to purchase the supply which would be wanted. He then

went on to argue for the principle of a fixed duty, as against that of a sliding scale. The result of the present system was an extensive decay in the manufacturing districts.

Mr. C. J. M. SUTTON said, that just as the members of that House were bound to prove themselves qualified for their seats, so ought the ministers of the crown to substantiate their qualifications for their offices. He would not now detain the House upon the question of the address, but he would take the liberty of asking Lord John Russell to what he had alluded in saying, on the late election of speaker, that he had been induced to oppose in 1835 the re-election of Mr. C. Manners Sutton on the ground of his personal conduct?

Lord JOHN RUSSELL answered, that as Sir R. Peel had referred the course taken in 1835 solely to the principle then affirmed, that the Speaker's opinions ought to be those of the majority of the house, he had thought it right to explain that he had himself proceeded, partly at least, on another ground; which was, that Sir C. M. Sutton, then Speaker of a House of Commons containing a large majority of members favourable to Lord Melbourne's government, had attended privy councils held for the purpose of transferring the powers of the state to the party of the minority. He acquitted Sir C. M. Sutton of any intentional disrespect to the House in attending those councils; but he regarded such attendance as an error of judgment sufficient to exclude him from the chair.

Dr. BOWRING enlarged upon the present suffering of the manufacturing poor, and ascribed it to the present state of the corn laws. He represented the impossibility of preserving our foreign commerce without legislative alterations; and warned the House that it must either go forward toward liberalism, or backward toward perdition.

Mr. PATRICK STEWART denied that the question of confidence in the ministry was the only proper matter of this debate. Representing a great Scotch county, where distress prevailed among the agricultural as well as among the manufacturing classes, he would contend for the principle of free trade advanced by the ministerial budget. As a colonial proprietor, he hailed the system now proposed, which went, for the first time, to treat the British colonists simply as British subjects. He contended for a fixed duty on corn in preference to a sliding scale.

Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD denied the existing corn laws to be for the advantage of the agricultural interest in general. They benefited the landlords only, not the tenants nor the labourers. He found fault with some omissions in the address, but declined to support the amendment.

Mr. COBDEN observed, that the question tested by the late election was said to be that of confidence in the ministry: gentlemen opposite, therefore, did not appear as the representatives of monopoly: he was glad to know that the people of England were not enamoured of monopoly. Members on the opposite side chose to touch upon every point in the conduct of ministers for ten years past, but had left untouched their last and most important act, the recommendation to revise the corn laws. In the olden time, conservative gentlemen used to treat the speech as if it were something pertaining to the monarchy, and not to drag ministers prominently forward without great occasion; and that, he thought, should still be done with a speech of the most popular monarch they had since the time of Alfred. For three years four millions of the people of this country had been petitioning for repeal of the food tax. Twenty millions of the people were dependent upon wages, and the food tax was a direct tax upon the body of the people. He called the attention of the House to its working—

The effect was this—it compelled the working classes to pay 40 per cent. more, that is, a higher price than they should pay if there was a free trade in corn. When honourable gentlemen spoke of 40s. as the price of foreign corn, they would make the addition 50 per cent. He would not overstate the case, and therefore he set down the bread tax as imposing an additional tax of 40 per cent. The report of the committee on the hand-loom weavers gave, among other things, the amount of the earnings of a working-man's family, and that was put down at 10s. The hand-loom committee then stated that out of the 10s. every family expended in the week 5s. in bread. Their tax upon that was 2s. weekly; so that every man who had 10s. weekly, gave out of that 2s. to the bread tax. That was 20 per cent. out of the income of every labouring family. But let them proceed upward and see how the same tax worked. The man who had 20s. a week still paid 2s. a week to the bread tax; that was to him 10 per cent. as an income tax. If they went further—to the man who had 40s. a week—the income tax upon him in this way was 5 per cent. If they mounted higher—to the man who had 5l. a week, or 250l. a year—it was 1 per cent income tax. Let them ascend to the nobility and the millionaires, to those who had an income of 200,000l. a year. His family was the same as that of the poor man, and how did the bread tax affect him? It was one halfpenny in every 100l. (Cries of "oh, oh!" and laughter from the opposition.) He did not know whether it was the monstrous injustice of the case, or the humble individual who stated it, that excited this manifestation of feeling; but still he did state that the nobleman's family paid to this bread tax but one halfpenny in every 100l. as income tax, while the effect of the tax upon the labouring man's family was 20 per cent. He wished not to be misunderstood upon this point. Suppose an honourable gentleman were to bring in a bill levying an income tax upon the different grades in society; let it then be supposed that it was proposed to impose upon the labouring man an income tax of 20l. per cent., and that the nobleman was to pay but a halfpenny out of every 100l.: in such a case as that he was sure that there was no member of that house, and he hoped no Christian man out of it, who would be parties to the imposing such a tax. And yet that was the tax which was actually levied, not for the purposes of the state, but for the benefit of the richest of the community.

It had been said that the manufacturers, who had never been allowed to state their own case, were desirous of lowering wages—that a repeal of the corn laws meant reduction of wages—

Now, if he knew what it meant, it meant increased trade. They did not wish to diminish wages, but they claimed the right to exchange their manufactures for the corn of all other countries, by which means they would, he maintained, very much increase trade; and how they could do that except by calling into operation an increased amount of labour he was at a loss to imagine. And he would ask, how could they call an increased demand for labour into activity without raising the rate of the wages of the working classes. Besides, as to foreign competition, he maintained that we did already compete with the foreigner. He maintained that we sold our manufactures cheaper than they were sold by any other country; for if we did not, how could we sell our manufactures upon neutral ground in competition with the producers of other countries? We now sold in New York every article in competition with the foreigners of other countries, and if we could there sell it cheaper than the foreigner, where was the protection given to the home producer?

Mr. Cobden argued to show that the rate of wages depended entirely on the demand for labour. He then alluded to the assemblage of 650—not thirty—ministers from all parts of the country, at an expense of 3,000l. or 4,000l. paid by their congregations. At that meeting statements were made, on unimpeachable authority, which showed that the condition of the people had wofully deteriorated within the last ten years, and that in proportion to the rise in the price of food. Besides the 650 ministers actually assembled, 1,500 others, from whom letters had been received were "offering up their prayers," said Mr. Cobden, "in their several localities to incline the will of Him who rules princes."

and potentates to turn your hearts to justice and mercy." Lord Stanley knew how to estimate such influence when he said that the moment the religious community and their pastors took up the question of slavery, the agitation must be successful. What would the people, in the condition he had described, feel, when they saw the recommendation of the Queen, to consider the restricted supply of food and diminished labour, scouted by the majority of the House as of secondary importance to the question whether a gentleman in a white hat opposite, or a gentleman in a black hat on this side, should occupy the treasury benches? Mr. Cobden declared himself to be neither whig nor tory. While acknowledging the virtue of the whigs in coming so far towards his own position, he promised that if Sir Robert Peel would advance one step further, he should be the first to meet half-way and shake hands with him.

Mr. H. BAILLIE declared that if he could believe, with the preceding speaker, that the repeal of the corn laws would benefit the great body of the people, he would vote for that repeal. But he would prove that during the last twenty years the manufactures of this country had been trebled, and yet the wages of the operatives had been greatly diminished; so that the interests of the masters and those of the workmen were anything but identical; and he cited documentary evidence to establish these propositions. Instead of attributing the distress of the people to the corn laws, he attributed it to the increase of machinery, and the consequent substitution of children for adults.

Mr. BROTHERTON claimed only that the agriculturists should do justice to the manufacturers. He admitted that manufactures had increased in quantity, but their price had fallen. Meanwhile the price of corn had risen, and the country had paid 74,000,000/- sterling more for food in the four years from 1836 to 1839 than in the four years from 1832 to 1835. How was our increasing population to be supported? You could not employ them in agriculture, and you would hardly transport them without their fault. Your only resource would be to afford increased employment by manufactures.

Mr. H. GRATTAN said that at no one election in Ireland had there been any expression of determination to maintain the corn laws—a sign that the Irish would make great personal sacrifices to show their disapprobation of the threatened change of ministry. It was not respectful to the Crown to say that you would give no answer to its message until it should have dismissed its messengers. The party opposite boasted of their majority: it had been returned by bribery and by intimidation. He called on Sir Robert Peel to keep his followers in order; but apprehended that the right hon. baronet, like Actaeon, was like to be eaten up by his own hounds. Mr. Grattan complained of irregularities at several elections, and of the employment of military, with an enthusiasm and energy which occasioned a good deal of cheering and laughter. At one election, said he, an officer stated, that apprehending a riot, he had ordered out "Justice to Ireland;" and being asked what he meant by justice to Ireland, he answered "a six-pounder." The party who were now declaring war against Ireland had better beware of America. He would not fight the battle of such a party against an American, or any other external invasion. He censured the ingratitude of the English people to the whig ministry, and trusted that his own countrymen would ever be united in the cause of civil and religious freedom.

Lord WORSLEY spoke next in a very low tone. He was understood to disapprove the amendment as containing nothing specific.

Mr. HASTIE followed, but was wholly inaudible from the unquiet state of the House.

Lord SANDON then moved the adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to.

Thursday, Aug. 26.

Lord SANDON contended that the question put to the country was not that of monopoly or no monopoly, not that of corn, sugar, or timber, but of confidence or no confidence in the ministers of the crown. The budget was a mere tub to the whale, and the constituencies had rejected it. He was not indifferent to the distress of his countrymen, or to the subjects thrown out for discussion; but he thought the present business of the House was simply to carry into effect the verdict which the people had returned.

Mr. GIBSON said that the party questions to which Lord Sandon attached so much importance were very uninteresting to the public. Everybody knew that there were now more members in the house favourable to Sir R. Peel's tenure of office than to Lord Melbourne's; why, therefore, say more about it? He did not believe that Lord Sandon represented the opinions of Liverpool. (The Speaker admonished Mr. Gibson of the irregularity of denying that a member was the legal representative of his constituents.) He did not mean that Lord Sandon was not the legal representative of the Liverpool constituency, but he had been returned, not by those who possessed the real interest of that borough, but by the freemen to whom the reform bill had so unfitly left the franchise. He censured as invidious the argument of Mr. H. Baillie, on the disposition of the manufacturers to reduce wages. What they wanted was not to reduce wages, but to effect that freedom of exchange which could be refused upon no principle of justice, and which he himself was desirous to effect by the abolition of all restrictions on the corn trade—restrictions enacted by a parliament of landholders for their own advantage. Under these corn laws the agricultural population had decreased; and the proportion of paupers had become greater in the agricultural than in the manufacturing districts. He did not speak as a party man, for he had no party attachments [roars of laughter]; and he wished there were more like him. He thought it disrespectful to the distresses of the country, that gentlemen opposite had last night declined to debate the main questions of the speech; he supposed their silence was imposed by their leader. It had been said that in the new House the ministerial party had diminished; but, at all events, the anti-corn law party had increased. Gentlemen had used to say slavery was good for the slaves; now they said that scarcity was good for the people.

Mr. BORTHWICK insisted that the question was not what financial propositions should be adopted, but what statesmen should be called in to deal with them.

Mr. SMITH O'BRIEN characterised the line now taken by the conservatives as a most pitiful one, and entered into a defensive retrospect of the general conduct of ministers.

Colonel SIBTHORPE congratulated the country on having reached

the day when the whigs were to be drummed out of office. They would have acted more decently if they had resigned without waiting for a second verdict against them, not from the people's representatives, but from the people themselves. He denounced them as an incompetent, a jobbing, and a bankrupt set of ministers.

Mr. POWELL (Limerick), though friendly to the principles of free trade, yet, considering the numerous interests which had grown up under the existing system, desired that its abolition should be a gradual one. He preferred a fixed duty to a sliding scale.

Mr. TURNER complained of the language in which the reformers and the Irish priests had been vilified by a member of the other House. He expressed his confidence in the present ministers, to whom he thought the country would again have recourse. The corn question would ultimately be carried, but carried without grace or credit, because upon compulsion.

Mr. ESCOTT commented on Mr. Labouchere's admission, that this budget had been brought forward by ministers on the pressure of their supporters. They stood in a situation in which, condemned as they were by parliament, they had no right to call on parliament to discuss any proposals of theirs. He vindicated those conservative members who had called for modifications of the poor law against Mr. Roebuck's imputations of insincerity; and blamed the unfairness of Dr. Bowring in ascribing the distresses which he had instanced to the operation of the corn laws, in a debate where the corn laws could not be directly discussed, but where a very mischievous impression might yet be produced and sent forth. And he could not help suspecting that another member, Mr. Cobden, had felt, when he volunteered a defence of the Manchester Conference, that there was in that affair something weak which required patching up. The members of that conference were not to blame for discussing political subjects, but for hypocritically censuring others who did the same thing.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER admitted the right of members opposite thus to bring to issue the question—who should govern?—but he did not approve the total silence observed by them on the great questions raised by the speech; and he thought it would have been fairer if, on a series of charges against ministers, some of the conservative leaders had come forward in the course of the debate to state the accusations, with the authority belonging to them. Those accusations had, however, been stated by others; and the first was, the breach of Lord Grey's undertakings for peace, retrenchment, and reform. If the whig cabinet had violated these pledges, to that violation Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham had been parties. Then were the present ministers to be turned out on such grounds, and Lord Stanley and Sir J. Graham to take their places? He then entered into some arithmetical details to illustrate and vindicate the financial management of ministers, taking credit, especially, for extinction of debt. The corn question, he admitted, could not properly be treated as a mere question of revenue; but he hoped the House would ere long consider it, and place it on some settled footing.

Mr. GOULBOURN animadverted on Mr. Baring's extraordinary omission of all reference in his speech to the great increase in the consumption of sugar within the last three months—consumption so great, that if its present rate should continue for the remainder of the twelve-month the revenue from sugar would be equal to that of the most favourable of former years. With respect to the imposts on timber, he cited an opinion of Lord Sydenham, laid before the legislature of Canada, strongly adverse to the immediate change of duties. He then entered into a counter-statement of figures, impugning the financial details of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The five years' comparison made by him between the finance of the whigs and that of the Duke of Wellington was accurately stated; but it showed that the Duke's Government had gone on decreasing expenditure, while the whig Government had gone on increasing it, and this without provision for meeting the annually growing deficiency. He ridiculed the assumption of ministers that they had extinguished a certain amount of debt, consisting of annuities for terms of years; since those annuities, in truth, by their efflux extinguished themselves, the annual payments having meanwhile been defrayed from revenue raised for that purpose by the preceding government. If this was the best case which ministers could make, they must now be content, after their conviction by the last parliament, to receive their judgment from this.

Mr. WAKLEY said, that ministers had not lost his confidence, for they had never possessed it. The constitutional radical party [laughter] was as much attached as the conservatives to the monarchy and the church; only the conservatives wished to rule the many by the few—the radicals to rule the few by the many. The conservatives were now preparing to tell the Queen they would not receive her speech from the present ministers: what would have been said if the radicals had done so?

Friday, Aug. 27.

Mr. MILNES recommenced the debate on the address, contending that the real issue was not the fitness of the measures propounded, but the fitness of the men who had propounded them.

Mr. RENNIE, Mr. WALLACE, Mr. HINDLEY, and Mr. HAWES followed in favour of ministers.

Captain POLHILL cited from Lord John Russell's work on the British Constitution several passages applicable to present circumstances, and illustrative of the right of parliament to remove a bad ministry.

Mr. M. J. O'CONNELL considered the question with reference to Irish interests, which he feared would not be the better for the approaching change of government.

Mr. CHRISTMAS could place no confidence in a ministry giving way upon every point, however important, when it found itself pressed by its supporters. In Ireland, the country with which he was connected, the proposed change in the corn laws was universally unpopular, although the objections of the Irish people to it were carefully suppressed for party purposes.—Sir Robert Peel would have a difficult task; he would be resisted by a strong and not scrupulous opposition; but in proportion to his difficulties would be his glory in surmounting them.

Mr. VILLIERS attributed the silence of the tories on the topic of the corn laws to an apprehension entertained by them, that at this critical moment the open profession of their opinions might disgust the country. He believed their majority was owing to one section of the popular party, to the chartists and the paupers, who wished to make them the instruments of chastising the other section. He believed

with Mr. Roebuck, that ministers had lost their power chiefly by having failed to fulfil their promises to the popular party; though he thought that too much had been made of Lord John Russell's unguarded expression about finality. However, that noble lord had gone far to redeem himself by his conduct upon the new measures of finance. The opposite party were coming in upon the ground of resistance to the principles of commercial freedom; and to such a party he could not give his support. He then read from statements produced at the Manchester Conference some details, showing an increase of mortality in certain manufacturing districts, which he ascribed to the want of food. Whenever the price of provisions rose, wages remaining the same, the labourer had less to spend in those coarser manufactures which they usually consumed; and by the consequent discontinuance of orders for goods, the manufacturing operatives were thrown out of employ. He then controverted the opinions expressed by Lord Stanley on the subject of protection to agriculture, in a speech lately addressed by him to his constituents in Lancashire, and professed his own inability to understand why it should be better for a country to encourage a population dependent on landlords, than on manufacturers. He believed that the opinions he now supported had gained ground in the country; and Sir Robert Peel, who possessed great moral influence over his party, would be under a proportionate responsibility for the course which should be taken on this important subject.

Lord F. Egerton bore a general testimony to the distresses of the manufacturing population. But he apprehended that on the question of the remedy, there was hardly less difference between the ministers and the conservatives, than between the ministers and the whole-length abolitionists who supported them.

Mr. O'CONNELL, as the freely elected representative of two Irish agricultural counties, had some right to stand up and speak to the question. Ireland was an agricultural country; and surely there, if anywhere, should be seen the boasted operation of these laws, in raising the rate of wages. The question between the conservatives and the people was, whether they should pay millions annually more for their food than they had a right to do. A Frenchman had often tried to fatten his horse; he had tried spices—every thing, but at last he was advised to try oats. So he would say to the party who affected such sympathy for the sufferings of the people, to give up their different schemes for fattening them, and to try bread; and if that would not effect the object, they might try any quack doctor they pleased. Mr. O'Connell then entered into a review of the actions of the whig party, when in power in 1805, and during the ten years in which the present ministers had been in office; and he contrasted their conduct with that of the great tory party. He charged them with obtaining their majority by the foulest bribery, and that majority was to be used to crush Ireland. But power was naturally unpopular, and the deeds of the tory party in power would be closely criticised.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said that whatever might be the weight of the vituperation of Mr. O'Connell on the tory party, it fell far short of what he had lavished on his beloved whigs. There was not a single man of any eminence among them on whom he had not lavished every species of vituperation which an imagination fertile in calumny could invent. Sir Robert Peel then apologised for the warmth of his expressions, but considered that he had received provocation. In the presence of the great interests at stake, he felt that all party exultation should be subdued; and if he were called upon to take a part in public affairs, while he would contemplate the difficulties before him with a manly spirit it was yet quite consistent with that feeling, that he should also feel a deep sense of responsibility. Sir R. Peel then turned to the consideration of those parts of the speech on which all parties were agreed, the great question of war or peace, referring to France and the United States. Respecting the former country he said—

No man learns with more cordial satisfaction that France has acted consistently with her honour in entering again into the great councils of Europe [hear, hear]. I do, however, hope that that re-union will not be a mere formal re-union, but that it will be accompanied with the restoration of those amicable feelings, and of that cordial and good understanding between this country and France, which is essential to the security and tranquillity of Europe [cries of "hear" from both sides of the house]. I have read with feelings of the greatest satisfaction the sentiments which have been recently expressed by a great statesman—I speak not of sentiments expressed in the assembly of the Chamber of Deputies of France, but of a public meeting, and whatever is stated at any meeting by a man so eminent, holding so high and important a situation, and who has proved himself so truly deserving of the character of a great statesman, as M. Guizot, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs in France, must command attention—I have seen, I say, with the utmost satisfaction this frank declaration from him—that he rejoices in the prospect of the restoration of a good understanding between France and the other Powers of Europe [hear, hear].

In commenting upon the passages in the speech, referring to the harmony subsisting between the powers of Europe, he gave expression to these important sentiments—

Is not the time come when those powerful countries may reduce their military establishments [hear, hear], when they may say to each other "there is no use in this relative increase of military strength?" And what, after all, is the use of one Power greatly increasing her navy or greatly increasing her army? Does not that Power know that for the purposes of protection and self-defence other Powers will follow the example? And does it not also know that there is no relative increase of military strength that does not produce a corresponding weakness in another direction [hear, hear]? By such a course you deprive peace of half its value, while you anticipate the energies of war whenever war may become necessary. It is no romantic idea, that when a nation has to trust to its armaments for security, profusion of its resources must weaken its power of protection. If each country will commune with itself, if each country will ask what is the state of its finances and those of every country in Europe, if each country will ask what is the danger to be apprehended at present from foreign aggression, compared with the danger of producing dissatisfaction and discontent from curtailing the comforts of the people by undue taxation, the answer it must give is this—that the danger from aggression is infinitely less than the danger of the preparation [hear, hear]. That is a question connected with the interests of Europe which I hope may be amongst the first attended to. It is not a question of which country shall exercise the greatest influence in this court or in another; the question is, whether it is not the true interest of the countries of Europe to come to some one common accord which shall enable them to reduce those military armaments which belong to a state of war rather than of peace [hear, hear]. I wish that the councils of each of those countries—and if their councils will not, I hope the public mind may influence them to do so—would turn their attention to the great revolution which has been brought about of late years in the feelings of Europe. A twenty-five years' peace, an increased intercourse of commerce, new connexions, and new interests, have effected a great change in public affairs. Take France, for instance; and what country in Europe, if common sense prevailed in the councils of that country, would wish to see such a nation curtailed of its legitimate proportion of authority in the general councils of Europe? Some persons are disposed to think that the old feeling of what is supposed to be national hostility towards France still prevails in this country. That is a complete mistake [a general cry of "hear"]. If you take the public opinion of this country in the proportion of 99 to 1, you will find that there is no other wish amongst her people than that France should consolidate the free representative institutions by which she is governed—you will find that there is not one feeling of rivalry directed against her successful competition in the paths of

science, or in the encouragement of the arts, of literature, of manufactures, of industry, and of commerce [hear, hear]. My firm belief is, that if France were in danger from unjust aggression, the security of the nation would not be found in the number of her regiments, but in the mind and public support of her people, who would rise with the energy of one man to dispel the danger of that aggression. The same may be said of that magnificent country Germany, in the public mind of which, though divided into separate states, there prevails at this moment a spirit and a force which extends from Hamburg to the Tyrol, and from Berlin to the southern confines of the country, and which, if the country were threatened with aggression, would likewise rise in all its fullness and its majesty, and annihilate the invaders [hear, hear]. In these are to be found the securities against aggression, and for the maintenance of peace; and not in

"Time-raised battlements or laboured mounds,"

in
"Thick-built walls or moated gates;"
but in man, bright-minded man, the same who, at the call of patriotism in Germany or France, would, at the notice of a moment, rise in all that energy which France displayed in '93 [cheers].

He should not have objected to the general words of the address on the financial questions, but for the declaration of ministers that the address was intended to bring those questions to an actual issue. His present reserve on the subject of the timber duties was amply justified by the circumstances of Canada, as apparent from a recently published despatch of Lord John Russell to the governor. On the proposal as to sugar duties, he had withheld his assent, in consideration, first, of the circumstances of Cuban slavery, and, secondly and mainly, on the ground of the increased supply now flowing in from our own colonies, and of the increased consumption which he understood was now going on in the mother country. With respect to the corn laws, he had declared, and he now repeated, that he preferred a sliding scale to a fixed duty, but that he reserved to himself the right of altering the details of that scale. How those details should be adjusted it would have been preposterous in him to state beforehand. Had he stated any details of his own, there would have been a general attempt to discredit them with the people; and, moreover, on his accession to office, he would have been irrevocably tied to every particular thereof. He had declared before the election that he would make no such announcement, and no pressure and no ridicule should induce him to revoke that resolve. The arguments of Mr. Cobden and others against what they called the bread tax were just as applicable to a fixed duty as to a graduated scale; the principles of free trade were just as adverse to the one as to the other; and those who now contended for the fixed duty avowed that they did not mean it to be a final arrangement, but a mere stepping-stone to the total repeal of protection. If the late bad weather had continued, and a bad harvest had followed, was it the intention to retain the fixed duty then? Or was the Board of Trade to have a power of remitting the impost in time of scarcity? And were such an impost and power consistent with free trade? (A member on the ministerial side said across the table that he would allow no such remission.) What! were the people, whose sufferings the hon. member had so sympathetically described, to understand that, however high the price, however great the scarcity, the duty was to be unrelentingly retained? He would tell that gentleman, however, that the retention of such a duty, in such circumstances, would be impossible. To prove that the variation of price would not be obviated by the abolition of the corn laws, he cited official documents, showing fluctuations of price to the extent of more than 100 per cent. in America and other countries where the corn trade was wholly free. He feared that no legislative remedy would wholly prevent the distresses to which the manufacturing classes must be subject from natural causes, from the unwise extension of credit, and from various other circumstances altogether independent of the corn laws. He had been taunted with his own retention of office after the vote against him on the address in 1835. He admitted that it amounted to a vote of want of confidence; and on the very first obstruction of a necessary measure (the Irish tithe bill) he had resigned. The present ministers had admitted two years ago that they had not the confidence of the House; yet still they had adhered to office; and that unconstitutional adhesion, injurious at once to the Crown and to the House of Commons, had, he firmly believed, done them more damage than any other cause with the constituencies of this country. If, now, he came into office, he should accede to it with the consciousness that he gained it by direct means. He would take it by no intrigue, by no unworthy concession, by no unnatural and factious combination; but by walking in the straight paths of the constitution; and he would relinquish it the moment he should cease to be supported by the confidence of the House and of the people.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL did not complain of the vote of no confidence; he thought that the first opportunity after the meeting of parliament was the very best that could be taken for that purpose. The noble lord then proceeded to consider the grounds on which the vote of no confidence was moved; and defended the policy pursued by the ministry in its foreign, colonial, and domestic government, which, he contended, had been successful at home and abroad. The motion of a vote of no confidence was an exercise of the right of the House, but it was an exercise of it in a case where the conduct of the government had not been proved to be worthy of condemnation. He explained the cause of the abandonment of the appropriation clause; and contended that Ireland would still be the difficulty of Sir Robert Peel, because he must place power in the hands of a small minority opposed to the feelings of the majority of the people. Sir R. Peel had not been called upon to give his detailed plans; he was merely asked to state the principles which would guide him. The right honourable baronet would adopt the reform act, and all those great measures to which he and his party had been opposed; but he resolutely adhered to the "sliding scale," which Lord John Russell firmly believed to be the cause of all the distresses of the country. The "sliding scale" was, in effect, a prohibitory duty, destroyed all regularity in commerce, and was injurious to the great body of the people. Lord John Russell admitted that if, according to Sir Robert Peel's supposition, corn rose so high as 90s. or 100s., no duty could be maintained at all. But he considered that if the field of supply was extended, the less likely was it that a scarcity should occur. The principles of free trade were greatly promoted by such a discussion as the present. If Sir Robert Peel would give them effect, he might safely despise the menace which had been uttered of overturning any ministry that would act in respect to the corn laws as the present ministers had done. Lord John Russell then referred to the advantage which had been taken of the unpopularity of the poor law, and of other misrepresentations—such as their being the enemies of the church, in order to swell the ma-

ority against ministers; and concluded with an appeal to the party about to come into power to use it for the interest of liberty and the good of the millions of mankind.

The House then divided at half-past two o'clock, when the numbers were:—

For the address	269
For the amendment	360
Majority.....	91

Saturday, Aug. 28.

The Speaker took the chair at twelve o'clock.

Mr. S. WORTLEY brought up the report on the amended address.

On the address having been read by the clerk at the table,

Mr. T. DUNCOMBE wished to know whether the last paragraph was intended to admit the distress of the country or not? The paragraph which the amendment had substituted for that of the address, was neither so respectful to the crown, nor so sympathising with the distresses of the country, as that contained in the address; and if it was intended to sympathise with the distresses of the people, he moved that the original paragraph be restored [hear, hear].

Sir R. PEEL said that the amendment had been prepared before the terms of the address were known, so that there could be no intentional want of respect and sympathy, if the paragraph in question had fallen short in these respects; but he contended that the amendment was not less respectful than the address itself; nor did it less recognise the distresses which unhappily existed in the country [hear, hear].

Mr. DUNCOMBE said, as the distresses of the country were admitted, he was satisfied, and withdrew his motion.

On the motion that the report be agreed to,

Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD moved that an amendment to the following effect be added at the end of the address:—"That we further respectfully represent to your Majesty, that, in our opinion, the distress which your Majesty deplores is mainly attributable to the circumstance of your whole people not being fully and fairly represented in this House; and that we feel it will be our duty to consider the means of so extending and regulating the suffrage, and of adopting such improvements in the system of voting, as will confer on the working classes that just weight in the representative body which is necessary to secure a due consideration of their interests, and which their present patient endurance of suffering gives them the strongest title to claim." It was contended that there was danger in extending the suffrage to the working classes, but he denied that there were any grounds for such apprehension of danger. The working classes had as great an interest in the prosperity and welfare of the country as any other class of the community. After some further remarks, the hon. member said, he brought this motion forward as a test of the liberal feelings of the House; and the division upon it would show who were the friends of the people and who were not [hear, and ironical cheers from the tory side of the house]. He concluded by moving his addition to the address.

Gen. JOHNSON seconded the motion.

Mr. WARD said, much as he concurred in the general observations which had fallen from the hon. mover, he must decline giving him his support on a question of so much magnitude, on an occasion when in point of fact there was no ministry in existence. For the ministers that sat on that side of the house last night were in effect defunct, and the ministry which was to follow was not yet formed. He for one was disposed in fairness to give the right hon. baronet that trial to which he was entitled after his declaration of last night [hear, hear].

Mr. ROEBUCK quite concurred in opinion with the hon. member for Sheffield. He, too, felt that the subject was of too weighty a nature to be dealt with by a side wind [hear], and that the right hon. baronet was entitled to have a fair trial after what had fallen from him. The people were now looking to him and his party; let them be tried—he knew that when they were tried they would be found wanting, as he had often said before [hear, hear]. But let them be tried; for his part he should, as soon as he sat down, take his hat and leave the house, not voting at all, without thinking thereby to compromise his character.

[The hon. member then left the house, followed by Mr. Ward, Mr. Hawes, and one or two other liberal members, amidst the loudest laughter and the most deafening cheers of exultation from the tories.]

Mr. WALLACE, Mr. T. DUNCOMBE, Dr. BOWRING, and Mr. WILLIAMS supported the motion, and the house divided.

For receiving the report	283
For Mr. S. Crawford's motion	39

Majority..... 244

The house then adjourned at a quarter before two o'clock until Monday.

Monday, Aug. 30.

THE ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

Lord M. HILL announced on the part of her Majesty her gracious answer to the address of this house, voted on Saturday last. It ended with stating:—"that her Majesty would take immediate measures for the formation of a new administration."

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL rose amid the most profound silence to address the house. Sir, said the noble lord, I have now to state to the house, that after the division of Friday night her Majesty's ministers thought it their duty at once to advise her Majesty to send the answer to the address adopted by the House, which they had just heard read, and humbly to tender their resignations to her Majesty, with a view to the immediate formation of a new administration. Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept our resignations, and I have to inform the House that we only hold office until our successors have been appointed. He added, that they had, on public grounds, considered it incumbent on them to take the opinion of parliament upon their late measures, and to continue their struggle up to the present point. They had come into office with great measures, and with great measures they quitted it. It had been the duty of Lord Melbourne to advise a young and inexperienced Sovereign; and the administration over which he presided had shown equal anxiety, for the constitution and for the prerogative. With respect to himself, he had endeavoured to exercise to the utmost advantage that judgment with

which he was endowed, and he and his friends would continue to offer in parliament the best counsels which it might be in their power to afford.

Lord STANLEY desired to do justice to the high honour of Lord John Russell, and to the perseverance and ability with which he had performed his arduous duties. But he could not agree with the noble lord that the speech of the Lords' Commissioners had been fitly made to raise the great questions in dispute between the two parties; nor could those questions have been decided by any vote which could possibly have been taken on the address.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL begged it might be distinctly understood, that the speech was, in the strict constitutional sense, not her Majesty's speech, but the speech of, and advised by, her ministers.

The house then adjourned until Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, August 24.

At a few minutes past five, the LORD CHANCELLOR having resumed his seat, and again read the Queen's speech,

Earl SPENCER rose to move the address. He adverted, first of all, to some of those topics which he was sure would prove satisfactory to their lordships—the prospect of continued peace, and the renewal of friendly diplomatic relations with the other states of Europe. As regards China, he believed no other course was open to the government than that which had been adopted. Whilst touching upon Canada, he passed a glowing eulogy upon Lord Sydenham. On the treaty of July, 1840, he confessed that he had felt regret that Lord Palmerston had appeared to abandon the line of policy marked out on the accession of the present government to office, and thus to hazard the peace of Europe; but the avowal which had been made by M. Thiers had proved that his apprehensions had been mistaken ones, and that ministers had acted with prudence and wisdom. But he rejoiced exceedingly at the renewal of peaceful and friendly diplomatic intercourse with France. It was a guarantee that the peace of Europe would be preserved; and he did not concur with those who stated that this country was not in circumstances to undertake a war. That did not abate his satisfaction with the renewed assurances we had now of preserving the peace of Europe. His lordship then entered upon the question of free trade. The general principle of non-interference by the legislature with commerce he thought a sound one; but it was a principle which admitted of exceptions. Earl Spencer then defended, one by one, the items of the late budget. On the corn question he said—

Upon this subject there had been much misrepresentation employed. They had been told by one party that the proposed alteration in the corn laws would throw a considerable portion of land in this country out of cultivation. Now he did not, for many reasons, think that was possible; but if any land were thrown out of cultivation, it would only be that of inferior quality. He had no hesitation in saying, that were the proposed alteration to have the effect of throwing considerable portion of the best land out of cultivation, it would be most calamitous to the country [hear, hear]. He did not believe that by the abolition of the corn laws the price of corn would be materially altered, and the price of corn in other countries would be in a great measure regulated by its price in England. The price of corn in this country depended upon the amount of the expenses of cultivation, and, during a course of years, it seldom fell below what was required in order to cultivate lands of inferior quality. Those persons who talked about land being thrown out of cultivation seemed to overlook the fact that the worst quality of land would be first thrown out, and that lands of superior quality would still continue to be cultivated. Before they came to throw good land out of cultivation, a considerable reduction of price must occur. Taking all these matters into consideration, it was, in his opinion, utterly impossible that the price of corn in this country could be materially diminished. It might be diminished in a small degree, but it would be very trifling indeed, even by an entire repeal of the corn laws.

If, in answer to this, it was urged that no good could therefore result from the change, he answered, it would give a great impetus to the manufacturing interests of the country, open foreign markets, and prevent the possibility of the manufacturer abroad competing with the British manufacturer. He adverted to the evils of the present system; to the fluctuations in price, to the want of return for capital, and to the unexampled distress of the labouring classes; and thus concluded his speech:—

He had entertained a fond expectation that her Majesty's government would have been enabled to carry out successfully those principles of free trade which they had the boldness to come forward to advocate. He felt strongly attached to that political party with whom he had acted during the course of his public life, and he should regret (as we understood his lordship, who spoke often in an almost inaudible tone of voice, to say) if they should, for advocating these principles, feel themselves under the necessity of retiring from office [cheers]. [The noble lord then read the address, which was merely an echo of her Majesty's speech.]

It was seconded by the Marquis of CLANRICARDE.

The Earl of RIPON cordially concurred in some of the points in the address, but not in others. He rejoiced in the friendliness between France and England; and for that much was due to the prudence, judgment, and moderation of the King of the French—much to his ministers. His satisfaction, however, would be greater if he saw that temporary differences had been settled on a firm basis: the Pasha of Egypt was still a powerful vassal, the Sultan a powerless sovereign: some points too remained unsettled between this country and Persia. He was surprised to find not a single allusion in the speech to the war, for such it was, now waging on the north bank of the Indus; of its commencement we have but scanty information, its end no man could predict. Our troops, too, were stationed in the Punjab, to watch the execution of a treaty between Shah Soojah ool Mookl and Runjeet Singh: Runjeet Singh was dead; the country was in a state of great commotion, and what our troops were to do, or how they were to get away, we were not told. These matters were omitted in the speech; a more singular warfare was noticed—

It was a war carried on at a great expense and a great sacrifice of human life, but carried on against an enemy who would not fight. We knocked his castles about his ears, destroyed his ships, and took away his guns; and then asked him to enter into a negotiation to give us redress for an attack, to bear with which would be a compromise of our honour as a nation. To this negotiation a kind of half-consent was given; but before its conclusion the island of Chushan, which we had taken and held for some time at a great sacrifice of human life, was restored to the Chinese government, and the treaty, such as it was, sent over here last year; but government refused to ratify it. Ministers had not told them, and showed no disposition to tell, whether all the plundering that had taken place in this affair was the result of the instructions sent out, or of those to whom their execution had been intrusted.

Passing by the subject of the United States in studious silence, Lord Ripon came to the three great subjects comprised in the budget of last year. The measures were propounded to meet a financial crisis. For the last five years he had called attention to the excess of expenditure over income. For four years of that time government had continued to supply the deficiency by the most objectionable means, tampering with the funds of the savings banks, and changing them for exchequer bills; and thus weakening the confidence of the industrious poor,

whose earnings were invested in those institutions. They had also followed the still more objectionable practice of reducing the balance in the exchequer to a very low sum, rendering the government liable to the necessity, in any sudden emergency, of proclaiming that it had "no assets." A million a year had been added to the funded debt of the country without any provision having been made to meet it. The deficiency thus accruing had been swelled by £2,500,000 hastily sacrificed in the post-office revenue. There is such a thing as a financial crisis, which, like a commercial crisis, cannot always be met when it occurs; and the country might be ruined before they knew where they were. This continued mismanagement of the revenue justified a want of confidence in the ministry. By the augmentation of the taxes in 1840, government admitted the failure of previous plans. In that year, however, they negotiated for a commercial treaty with France; which, had it been carried into effect, would have made it necessary to call upon parliament for the means of meeting fresh difficulties, as it would have created new deficiencies. This retrospect brought Lord Ripon to the budget of last session. He asked how an increase of 100 per cent. on Canadian timber could benefit the consumer; how the consumer would profit by a reduction of 5s. in 110s. [55s. the average cost of the article, and 55s. duty], which was the price of Baltic timber; or what advantage he would derive from a relief of a fraction of a farthing a pound, which the proposed alteration of the duties would effect in sugar. He objected to disturbing the great experiment of emancipation in the West Indies; and he insisted that consideration was due to the East Indies, a country capable of supplying us with sugar, for the extinction of her cotton trade through our competition. With respect to the corn laws, he asked if government were for a free trade in corn? The immediate and the ulterior result of their proposition had both to be considered: the arguments of the mover and seconder of the address went for total repeal of the corn laws; it was customary for ministers to confer with the mover and seconder, and they must have been aware that they would argue for free trade; and it was therefore neither unfair nor uncharitable to infer that that was the end and object of the whole scheme. Lord Ripon undertook to show that the corn law had attained its objects. The average price of corn for the last twelve years had been 58s. 3 5-6d.—not at all an extravagant price; the average for the first six years had been 59s. 1d., for the other six, 57s. 6 1/2d.—something approaching to an equality of price. In the first four years of the same period the price had been 63 10 1/2d., and the amount imported was 4,936,822 quarters; in the last four years the price was 64s. 4 1/2d., the importation 6,780,803 quarters; in the middle period the price was 46s. 8 1/2d., the importation 205,899 quarters; so that corn was admitted when it was wanted, excluded when it was not. The government scheme, on the contrary, was vicious and fallacious, or at all events uncertain. The government, the country, and all parties were in a position which evidently rendered it impossible for the public business to go on. He therefore moved, as a substitute for the latter portion of the address, an amendment similar to that moved in the house of commons.

Earl FITZWILLIAM complained that Lord Ripon did not propose any measures in lieu of those which he rejected, but contented himself with saying that ministers did not possess what was technically called "the confidence of the House." The meaning of the amendment was merely this, "We are the many, and you are the few; and therefore you must retire and make way for us." Such was not the case ten or eleven years ago, when a party of whom Lord Ripon was a member was coming into power: they made no mystery of their intended measures. How were they to equalise income and expenditure? by proposing a property tax or land tax? To prove how little we are now independent of foreign countries, Lord Fitzwilliam quoted returns to show that for each period of twelve years since 1775 the average annual importation of wheat had swelled from 179,000 quarters to 863,000 quarters. The foreign supply was unavoidable: the only question remaining for parliament to discuss was, in what manner the country shall have the foreign supply. The population is increasing at the rate of 250,000 a year: allowing one quarter of corn to the acre, could the country bring an equal number of acres into cultivation yearly? It was impossible. The question of corn law repeal was gaining in public opinion: the adhesion of government had enabled it to take a vast stride; and that the act had destroyed the administration was of little importance compared to the advantage gained.

Lord LYTTELTON would vote for the address; but he could not allow his vote to be construed into one of general confidence in ministers: he did not approve of their adherence to place after repeated defeats last session, to say nothing of previous occurrences. Ever since their abandonment of their appropriation clause they had remained in office on an unfulfilled pledge. Lord Lyttelton expressed his belief that in the main liberal principles must be carried out by any ministry which may be called to office.

Viscount MELBOURNE began by laughing at the elaborate superstructure which his noble friend Lord Ripon had raised upon such slight foundation—

The noble lord made a sort of omniumgatherum speech: impressed every thing into his service, as well what we had done last year as during the present; and on such a collection of heterogeneous materials he founds a motion of this magnitude—motion so important in its consequences, and a motion, allow me to say, perfectly new to this House. My lords, it came like a thunderclap upon me. [Roars of laughter from the opposition]. I own I was ignorant that there existed in this House the spirit on which that motion seems to proceed. We all know that there were a great many factious motions in the late House of Commons, and continual motions of want of confidence; but there was not the least intimation that your lordships sympathised with or countenanced any such proceeding. Your lordships were reposing a tranquil confidence in the present government, when suddenly, on the grounds stated by the noble lord, unexpectedly, contrary to all former precedent, belying, in fact, the manner in which you have heretofore conducted yourselves, the noble lord has come forward with this distinct motion of a want of confidence in her Majesty's government.

Lord Melbourne ridiculed Lord Ripon's enumeration of the omissions in the speech about the Indian wars: he disapproved of government's proceedings in Candahar, thought that they had formed improper alliances in the Punjab, and added that Ranjeet Singh was dead: surely ministers were not responsible for that? The Chinese authorities had provoked the measures which had been taken in their country; but to make any observations on the conduct of the expedition, Lord Melbourne said would be premature. Lord Ripon found fault with the measures now submitted to parliament by government, but agreed with the principles of all. Why, that was all that government asked; details were open to revision. Lord Melbourne was as much opposed to the slave trade as any man; but he did not think

that the way to eradicate that traffic was by commercial hostility with slave countries. As to the argument that the Indian trade in sugar should not be interfered with at present by the sugar of slave states, if it had any force, it would grow stronger every day, and Lord Ripon should take care that he did not shut himself out from measures which he might one day think proper. Lord Melbourne believed that the proposed fixed corn duty would give greater steadiness to the market. He would briefly state the arguments which had weighed with him in the question—

I have certainly been, on former occasions, for putting off the agitation and discussion of this question, which, whenever it came on, I knew must be attended with the circumstances which my noble friend has described. But I always knew that come it must. I always knew that it was not to be avoided. I always knew that it was entirely a question of time. And I beg of your lordships to consider, what I have always looked upon as the pinch of this question, namely, that these laws have been introduced and supported by those who have a direct interest in maintaining them. They were sanctioned by two Houses of Legislature, one of which is entirely composed of landholders, and the majority of the other consists of the same class. I say that is not a state of things which you should look on with complacency. I am not accustomed to speak in the language of dictation or admonition, but I tell you it is not safe for the governing powers of a country to stand in such a situation as to be open to an imputation of so popular, so plausible, and so specious a nature as that which I have described; and I do assure your lordships that you will find it absolutely necessary to put these laws some day or other on a more reasonable and satisfactory foundation.

Lord Melbourne believed that no base or sordid motives had governed those by whom the act had been passed; but he called upon the Lords to free themselves from the imputation of such motives; "for nothing is so foolish as to have the discredit of that which you do not do." After collecting a number of small things, Lord Ripon's charges against the government dwindled down at last to a charge of having legally but not constitutionally converted the funds in the savings banks, and of leaving a small balance in the exchequer: if there were no discontent, however, among the managers of the banks, no distrust on the part of the depositors, and no inconvenience in the exchequer, the charge could form no foundation for a motion like the amendment. Lord Lyttelton, too, had excluded ministers from his confidence: perhaps they would have been as well off without his vote. He had alluded to the appropriation clause: all that was meant by the resolution which declared that no settlement of the tithe question would be satisfactory without the appropriation of church revenues to some other purpose, such as education, was, that ministers would do their best to carry it [opposition laughter]. Sir Robert Walpole had abandoned his excise act after professions very similar to those which ministers had used.

The Duke of WELLINGTON rebuked Lord Melbourne for slighting instead of answering Lord Ripon's speech. Ministers were not to be blamed for creating charges by carrying on large operations, but for not using sufficient force to put an end to those charges, and for not making provision for the charges as they arose, in the constitutional mode, by ways and means. But he had other grounds for want of confidence: he condemned the words respecting the corn laws introduced in the speech of June last—that "the trade, the industry, and the burdens upon the community were materially involved in the question of these laws," and that her Majesty had "no other view in the dissolution of her parliament than the desire of securing the rights and promoting the interests of her subjects.

The Duke especially regretted that advice which had dictated the speech of this session should have come from Lord Melbourne—

He had always considered, that the noble viscount had rendered the greatest possible service to her Majesty. He had reason to know that her Majesty herself was of opinion that the noble viscount had rendered her the greatest service, not only as a public servant engaged in the conduct of affairs, but in the assistance he had given her Majesty in making her acquainted with the laws, policy, and system of government in the country. It was therefore peculiarly the duty of the noble viscount to watch over her and protect her. The noble viscount ought not to have embarked her Majesty's name in this cause, as had been done in the speech from the throne in July, and still less in that delivered by the Lords' Commissioners this day. The laws which regulate the trade in corn were characterised in the most invidious manner, as "aggravating the natural fluctuations of supply, embarrassing trade, deranging the currency, and by their operation diminishing the comfort and increasing the privations of the great body of the community;" and parliament was called upon to say whether such were not the characteristics of these laws. He was sorry this had been the case.

Before Lord Melbourne charged his opponents with opposing the wishes of the Queen he should have imparted to them some of that real knowledge which he had possessed: committees of inquiry should have been appointed by government, instead of being content with one appointed on the motion of an individual member of the other House. In conclusion, the Duke recommended the House to entertain no project which would destroy the cultivation of the country; a branch of industry most important to the welfare of all classes. England was the only country where, in the lowest ranks of life, not only might a competence be acquired, but immense wealth: that fact should never be lost sight of.

Lord MELBOURNE denied that ministers had ever said that those who opposed the measures contained in the royal speech were opposed to the Sovereign.

The Duke of RICHMOND was astonished at the arguments used by so distinguished a grazier as his noble friend Lord Spencer. If the proposed measures were carried, he should move a bill to enable farmers to throw up their leases. It had been said that those who were likely to replace the present ministers would turn round when they were in power and make some proposition similar to that which they now opposed: but, in the name of the landlords, he declared, that if they proposed a fixed duty, those by whom they were brought into power would also turn them out of power.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE assured the House, that nothing irregular had been done in respect of the funds of the savings banks; the first of which he had the pleasure to assist in establishing. He repeated the denial that ministers had made unconstitutional use of the Queen's name—

In no place, and on no occasion, had any one connected with government stated either that her Majesty was favourable to a repeal of the corn laws, or that she entertained different views from those entertained by her ministers; but in all the speeches put into her Majesty's mouth, it had been the object of ministers studiously to commit her Majesty to nothing in point of opinion on this question beyond this, in which, he believed, every noble lord would concur, namely, the importance and necessity of considering and inquiring into the subject.

With respect to committees of inquiry upon which the Duke of Wellington insisted, Lord Lansdowne said, that the subject before parliament had been incessantly submitted to committees; and in 1822-3 a committee sat and reported, of which Sir Robert Peel, Lord Althorp, Lord Melbourne, Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Robinson (the Earl of Ripon), were members. The report, which emanated from Mr. Robinson, recommended a fixed duty as the best protection to the agriculturist. He

reminded the House of the predictions of ruin which attended Mr. Huskisson's proposal to remove the restrictions on foreign wool: whereas the farmers and labourers had actually benefited by the change.

The Earl of COVENTRY, who announced himself by saying, "I am Lord Coventry: a few words from me," supported the amendment in half a dozen sentences; and then sat down, hoping he had not detained the House, amid roars of laughter and cries of "Go on!"

The Marquis of NORTHAMPTON would not vote for the amendment, for that would be voting in the dark; and though he disagreed with ministers on the sugar duties and also on the subject of corn, he should vote for the address.

Lord BROUHAM first addressed himself to show the fallacy of Lord Ripon's arguments in favour of the corn laws based upon the averages of price. There was no proposition whatever that might not be proved by the mode of calculation adopted: with an average of 60 there might be a fluctuation from 20 to 120, and the question at issue related to fluctuations and actual prices, and not to averages. But passing by minor points, he regretted the position which ministers had taken, in a constitutional point of view. With some qualification as to their insufficiency, he approved of the measures comprised in the budget. But in counselling a dissolution of parliament, his noble friends had been guilty of a great error in judgment—

They must, when they gave that advice, not only have entertained a confident expectation, but have felt absolutely certain, that a majority would be returned in favour of them and of their measures. They could not have entertained the least doubt that they would have majority—not a bare majority—not such a majority as that which for some time past had enabled them to linger rather than to live—not a majority of twos or threes, or of eighteen or twenty—but such a majority as would enable them to carry on business of the country—such a majority as might fairly be called a crushing majority. On this they could have felt no uncertainty when they tendered that advice to the Sovereign. He was not permitted to suppose that they entertained a shadow of doubt upon the subject. Why did he say so? Because on no other conceivable supposition had they a right to tender such advice—to advise the Crown to dissolve a parliament—to counsel a sovereign to exercise the highest and most important of the prerogatives; but to counsel the Crown to have recourse to that prerogative for the purpose of what, if it were not to return a majority in their favour, and a decided majority? for the purpose of returning a larger minority than their adversaries might gain if they succeeded to power and dissolved. He wished to use no offensive expression, and therefore he should only say, that that was an advice which no British minister dared to avow that he had given to his Sovereign. But he went further, he acquitted his noble friends of having by possibility been guilty of giving such advice. It would be to advise the Sovereign to become party to a mere factious manoeuvre; therefore he denied that it was possible that any one of his noble friends could have given such advice.

He entered a protest against the supposition that the people had pronounced judgment on the measures at the late election—

If he merely cared for the party that had brought these measures forward, he might say that the country had returned a verdict, not against the government, not against the men, but against their measures. But did men suffer nothing in character who had suffered such a judgment? Would the interests of the people have suffered nothing by returning such a judgment? and, above all, would the questions themselves suffer nothing by such large majorities pronounced against them? Undoubtedly a great injury would be done to these measures; they would be sacrificed in the hopeless attempt to prop up the fallen fortunes of a party in power who brought them forward. He would not admit that that was the construction to be put on the verdict which the country had returned. He thought their lordships would perceive that the verdict was on one issue and the trial on another—that the country had given their verdict against the men, but that on the subject of their policy no verdict had been returned, or opinion expressed.

Though it was undeniably true that the attention of ministers had been for a considerable time directed to these measures—the correspondence with the governor of Canada showed that they had not been suggested by the defeat of April—the coincidence in point of time had excited the suspicion of the country: ministers had delayed this course until they seemed to be driven to it; and the cause was further damaged by being made a handle to serve their purpose at the elections. But that was not all—

The measures were good in themselves. The principles upon which they were founded were sound. They were calculated to relieve the trade of the country; but they were not brought forward as measures for relieving that trade. Upon that foundation they could have stood, and stood firmly; but they were brought forward as measures of finance. That was a rotten foundation, and upon that foundation they could not stand. They were sound and well constructed measures as measures of commercial policy, but as measures of financial policy it was impossible to listen with patience to any argument in their favour. The smallest statement of figures, the most cursory glance at accounts, the slightest knowledge of financial matters, would make it impossible for any man to say that they ought to be regarded as measures of taxation and finance. Take the corn question for instance—his noble friend had argued with respect to the timber and sugar duties—but taking the corn laws, could any mortal believe that any portion of the revenue could be regarded as becoming a stationary source of revenue which was to be dependent on the seasons and the price of grain at home? Look at the averages—look at the prices which had prevailed during the years 1834, 1835, and 1836—and they would find that not one farthing of revenue could be got from that source. During every one of those years, the duty, the freight, and the charges of shipping, would have made it impossible for a single bushel of foreign grain to be brought into this country.

But the great defect in the government scheme was, that it professed to be a free trade scheme, yet it commenced with doubling the duty on Canadian timber, while it took only 9 per cent. off the duty on Baltic timber, and 1s. 6d. a hundredweight, half a farthing a pound, off foreign sugar, and imposed a fixed duty of 8s. a quarter on corn.

On these grounds he was clearly of opinion that the result of the late election could not be said to have been a verdict against the repeal of the corn laws, or against the principle of free-trade; but that it had been clearly against the general policy of the government, and that it indicated a distrust of the administration, which he could not but say he thought justified that statement in the amendment—of which, by-the-by, not one word had been said by those of his noble friends who had spoken upon it—the statement that her majesty's ministers had lost, not the confidence of parliament merely, but "the confidence of the country." "The confidence of this House" would have been very incorrect expression indeed, inasmuch as the ministers never had possessed it; but it could not be denied that the elections had decisively demonstrated that they had lost the confidence of the nation.

Lord Brougham had protested, on the 21st of June, before the dissolution, against being bound by the "appeal to the people" as it was called, under the circumstances. Ministers ought to have resigned as soon as they knew the result of the elections: as it was, they had incurred the delicate task of framing the royal speech. It might be said indeed that they could not know the adverse majority with which they were to meet until they ascertained it in the votes of members; but Lord John Russell had announced in a letter to his constituents that an overwhelming majority had been returned against the government. A speech, therefore, had been prepared, to be rejected by an overwhelming majority in both Houses. The opinions of that speech could have been entered upon the journals of the House in a much more regular and constitutional manner. Alluding before he closed to the late elections, Lord Brougham observed that they had been conducted with bribery and intimidation and actual outrage to an unprecedented extent: unless inquiries were instituted, both parties in parliament must be content to share the imputation of screening the guilty. Their lordships had peculiar means of inquiry: if they were to inquire—with a view of course to

legislation, not punishment—the character of the House would be greatly raised in the estimation of the country. Lord Brougham promised that if the new ministry should adopt a liberal policy, they should have, not his taunts, but his support. He did not admit the justice of the analogy between the ministers' abandonment of the appropriation clause and Sir Robert Walpole's abandonment of the excise bill; nor did he concur in the too strong language used by Lord Lyttelton, that the surrender of the appropriation clause exhibited a total want of political integrity—

He did not agree with him: he thought that he had only exhibited a great fulness of the desire to remain in office. The comparison he thought inappropriate. The case of Walpole would have been like that of the noble viscount, if Sir Robert Walpole, in the teeth of the minister whom he afterwards supplanted, had brought in a resolution, as leader of the opposition, that no plan of finance deserved the support of Parliament and the country which did not involve a tax upon exciseable commodities, and if, after the lapse of a short period obtaining a majority in the House of Commons upon that motion, when he turned out his rivals and got into their place, he then brought in a budget in which a tax upon exciseable commodities formed a prominent feature, and finding that he would be beaten upon it, withdrew it summarily, said nothing at all about it, and still retained office. Then the case of Sir Robert Walpole would have borne some resemblance to that of his noble friend, and might indeed have formed some precedent for his conduct.

The House then divided: for the address, 96; for the amendment, (including 13 proxies,) 168; majority against ministers, 72.

Monday, August 30.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Lord MELBOURNE rose and said, My lords, it now becomes my duty to acquaint your lordships, that in consequence of the vote come to by the other House of parliament on Saturday morning, which was precisely similar in terms to that come to by your lordships at an earlier period of the week, I, on the part of my colleagues and myself, have tendered to her Majesty the resignation of the offices we hold, and which resignation her Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept; and we now continue to hold those offices only until our successors are appointed.

The announcement was received in profound silence; and the House then adjourned until Monday next.

MANCHESTER CONFERENCE.

The following circular has been extensively circulated by the committee.

Manchester, 26th August, 1841.

DEAR SIR,—Your kind and considerate attention is directed to the foregoing documents. The resolutions were passed and the petitions and addresses adopted to the Ministerial Conference, convened in the Town-hall, Manchester. To the following resolution we would specially solicit your fullest deliberation:—

"That this Conference earnestly recommends, to all who may approve of it, to set apart Monday, the 6th of September, as a day for humiliation before Almighty God on account of our sins, and for solemn prayer that it might please him in his mercy to remove the distress which at this time afflicts the poor, and to endow our senators, at this important crisis, with wisdom."

We earnestly hope you will be able, with your congregation, to co-operate in carrying this resolution into effect, whether in your separate relation as a religious community, or in conjunction with other friends in your vicinity. You will perceive its character and object, as it recommends the 6th of September being set apart for religious observances, with a reference to the state of the country and of trade. If you would employ your influence also in procuring the assistance of the local press, giving publicity to this recommendation, as well as to the subjoined documents, you would greatly aid the cause.

The Conference adopted no resolution as to measures to be pursued by congregations, either as a means of reaching the legislature, or of awakening the country, feeling that interference on this point was not required. But we would suggest that after the fullest information has been given no delay should be allowed till an appeal be made to parliament by each congregation as such; and we would also submit it to your judgment, whether, as a minister, you might not separately petition both Houses of Legislature, and thus keep, as much as possible, the question on the high ground of religious principle and obligation. As heavy expenses have been incurred by the recent Conference, should you or your friends feel inclined to contribute, your donations, sent to either of the secretaries, will be gratefully acknowledged.

We are, Dear Sir, faithfully yours,

R. FLETCHER,

W. M'KEROW, SECRETARIES.

J. W. MASSIE,

P. S. Any communications as to the proceedings adopted in your neighbourhood, which you think may be interesting, or likely to promote the cause, may be directed to us, care of Mr. Joseph Hickin, Office of the Anti-Corn-Law League, Market-street, Manchester.

POSTSCRIPT.

Wednesday, September 1, 1841.

THE NEW MINISTRY.

We learned at a late hour last night that Sir Robert Peel will leave town this morning for Windsor Castle, when the right honourable baronet will submit to his Sovereign the list of a new ministry.

It is positively asserted that, in addition to the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, the Earl of Aberdeen, Earl of Ripon, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Stanley, the Right Honourable Sir James Graham, and the Right Honourable Henry Goulburn, will form the chief members of the cabinet.

The household of his Royal Highness Prince Albert, it is also said, will undergo but a very trifling change; and it is expected that Mr. E. Anson will continue treasurer to his Royal Highness.—*Morning Chronicle.*

The following answer to the address to her Majesty from the Manchester Conference has been returned, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Vaughan, by Lord Normanby.

Whitehall, August 30, 1841.

SIR,—I have had the honour to lay before the Queen, the loyal and dutiful address from the Christian ministers of various denominations assembled in Manchester.

And, I have to inform you that the address was very graciously received by her Majesty.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

NORMANBY.

Rev. R. Vaughan, D.D.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"A Subscriber" is in type, but deferred till next week for want of room.
 "A Wesleyan Dissenter" next week.
 "Caladoniensis" would confer an importance upon the party upon whose remark his strictures are made, which he does not merit. For this reason we do not insert his letter.
 The communication from Coventry, if given in our columns, would open the door for a host of similar ones. It is, besides, too long for our very limited space.
 "N.C." will not suit us.
 "James Humphreys" received.

Terms for advertising in the *Nonconformist*.

For 8 lines 5s. 0d.	For 16 lines 7 0	For 24 lines 9 0
10 5 6	18 7 6	26 9 6
12 6 0	20 8 0	28 10 0
14 6 6	22 8 6	Every additional 2 lines, 6d.

The Nonconformist.

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1841.

THE FALL OF THE LEAF.

THE amendment on the address has been carried by a majority of ninety-one—ministers have resigned—the reform season has terminated—the leaves, long since brown and withered, which gave some appearance of life to the tree which the people once prized so highly, have been whirled from off the twigs to which they adhered—and now comes winter—stern, cheerless, unproductive, but not useless winter.

Of the outgoing ministry we need not speak. Our opinions of them have been declared frankly and fearlessly. The spring-time of their official career was indeed promising—but the fruit they produced was not in proportion to the profusion of early bloom. That they gave the country several valuable measures we have no disposition to deny. But we affirm, without fear of contradiction, that their liberality always increased with their difficulties, and as uniformly died away in the day of their power. When they could have done "the state some service" they were most unwilling—when they were most willing their ability was gone. They have managed to dispirit and divide reformers—to fritter away an overwhelming majority—to produce general distrust in the professions of liberal men—to leave the constituencies of the nation in a state of unprecedented corruption—and to hand over at last the powers of office to a tory majority of fearful strength.

The advent of Sir Robert Peel to power is the commencement of a new era in the progress of reform—the setting in of political winter. Toryism, like frost and snow, may have its uses, but like them it is pinching in its operation, possesses no kindness, and serves only to cheer one in the prospect of the nearer approach of another spring and summer.

Let those who will expect liberal measures from Sir Robert—we cannot. Putting entirely out of view the whole past course of the honourable baronet—his education, his evident tastes, his measures and his no measures, it is impossible to anticipate anything more than a seeming reform out of the materials with which he will have to work. Were his political tendencies less aristocratic than they are, and his ability far greater than he has yet displayed, he would be loath, we think, to risk his present supremacy by attempting to work out any extensive measure of good to the people by means of his present supporters. We doubt much whether the attempt would not bring down upon him instant defeat. The Buckinghams and the Winchelseas, and the hundreds of others who now tolerate Sir Robert because he can better do their work than another man, are not likely to turn to at his bidding and do his. Peel is but an apparent leader—he is a real fag.

And now let us mark the likelihoods of the case. The corn laws constitute at present the great burdeu of the suffering people. Are these likely to be so effectually modified by the tories as to afford seasonable relief? We answer, No! The wily premier will make a show of concern for the people, as he always does, and will attempt to cozen them out of every sound principle.

We have his own word for it that he will adopt the sliding scale—we have his further assurance that he will not pledge himself to details. We deem it somewhat worse than foolish to attempt to build hopes of such relief as the country craves upon so narrow and so unstable a foundation. By adopting the sliding scale he gets rid of the free trade principle which gave to the measures of his predecessors the only value they possessed—he retains all the evils of the present system—its fluctuations of price, its encouragements to gambling, its frequent derangement of our whole monetary system—and he shuts out the advantages which even the measures of the whigs would have partially secured—steady and extended commerce, general employment, and foreign markets for our manufactures. Sir Robert will give the poor man a slice more bread for his penny, if he can earn it—but he will do nothing to assist the industrious artizan in finding and making the most of his employment.

If, however, the elementary materials which go to make up the party of which Sir Robert Peel is leader, coupled with the premier's declarations, are considered insufficient to contradict the new-born expectations of his liberality, surely the dictum of the Duke of Richmond and the avowed satisfaction of the Duke of Buckingham ought to dispel the dream. Men's wishes, not their reason, must be father of the thought. Nothing whatever in the professions of the party, nothing in their past history, nothing in their known character, nothing in their present conduct, fairly prompts an idea that they will prefer serving the people and saving the country to carrying out the objects of the landed interest. The very necessity of a great change in our commercial policy, in so far at least as

the importation of corn will be affected by it, is in sc many words denied. Is Sir Robert to be liberal "*malgre lui?*" Will not the country take his own word for his future course, backed by the emphatic declarations of his own friends?

With matters thus made plain before their eyes, it ill becomes the members for Sheffield and Bath, to declare their purpose to give Sir Robert a fair trial. This is we suppose the first fruits of an understood compact between the whigs and radicals, that all differences shall be merged until the tories are got rid of. Thus will the whigs carry out in opposition the same damping system which they adopted when in power—and the poor radicals must sink all their principles with a view of upsetting a conservative government, and afterwards in order to confirm the whigs. A fair trial! Has not Sir Robert told us distinctly that he will abide by the sliding scale? Does he not virtually by such a declaration throw free-trade principles overboard. A fair trial! Is not Mr. Roebuck an advocate for a large extension of the suffrage, for the protection of the ballot, for shortening the duration of parliaments? Who has wheedled him into the whig policy of giving the man who openly repudiates every one of these changes a fair trial? Has Lord John so tickled the vanity of the member for Bath, that he cannot discern the identity of giving the tory government a fair trial, and standing by to afford a great party a clear chance of bringing an already wretched country to ruin?

The perfect nonchalance with which all parties are proceeding—the sang froid with which the interests of the nation are handed over by the whigs to the tories—the haste and zeal with which they rush into a four days' discussion upon the question who shall have place—the carelessness about the terrible sufferings of the masses—all these are marks that a reform parliament is hastening to premature senility, and sinking into dotage long before its time. The end is drawing nigh. Deep-seated, wide-spread disgust has taken hold of all classes. Things cannot last in their present position long—men cannot be long governed by powers which they despise.

Meanwhile, however, want makes its ravages among the unemployed poor, and as they silently, almost unmurmuringly, seek obscurity and die, the House of Commons looks on and cheers them for their patience and submission. Hunger will not stay its dreadful importunities until the tory majority has had its fair trial—nor will foreign manufacturers await the event before they adopt new improvements, and seek admission to new markets. Whilst the whigs with their new allies, Messrs. Roebuck and Ward, are giving Sir Robert his fair trial, capital will be seeking profitable investment abroad, and disease will be doing its work of death at home. A deficient harvest, a prospect of tightness in the money market, general declension of trade, half our population unemployed, discontent heaving the lower strata of society in both England and Ireland, and, we may add, winter approaching to give new rigour to the sufferings of the poor—will all these elements of national convulsion cease to operate whilst the new premier is deliberating as to the best method of pleasing a selfish aristocracy without allowing the country to guess his real purpose? Truly the fall of the leaf precedes winter.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND'S DICTUM.

IN the debate on the address in the House of Lords, the Duke of Richmond is reported to have given utterance to the following words:—

"It was said that those who were likely to replace the present ministers would, when they obtained power, turn round with some similar proposition; but he in the name of the landlords would say, that if they proposed a fixed duty, those by whom they were brought into power would turn them out of power also."—*Times, August 25.*

This is one of those *escapades* which tell more truth in a single sentence than can be usually gathered from the speeches of parliamentary debaters throughout a whole session. Not, indeed, that the information given is novel in its character, but that the facts assumed are seldom so explicitly admitted. We beg to call the attention of our readers to the most prominent of them.

We learn then from the Duke of Richmond's lips, that the present government has been pushed into power by the landlords of the country. That it is not voluntarily elected to office by her Majesty is matter of notoriety—that it is not chosen by the people is also clear. The Duke informs us in the name of landlords, that in the event of Sir Robert Peel proposing a fixed duty he will be ousted by the same body which has thrust him into power. This is carrying out the whig design in framing the reform bill, with a vengeance. The flimsy disguise which veiled from the eyes of the people the real character of the constitution under which they live, is now torn asunder—and we learn from conservative authority that this country is governed by a ländocracy. Let this point be regarded as from henceforth and for ever settled—that the real rulers of Great Britain are the landlords of Great Britain.

We are told moreover by this erst whig nobleman, not only who are the government, but for what purpose and for whose advantage government is carried on. The landlords have determined against a fixed duty—therefore a fixed duty shall not be adopted by Sir R. Peel's administration. When a body of men, possessed of the same kind of property, resolve to oppose any political change by which that property may be affected, their motives, however artfully dressed up, cannot escape detection. Were the question respecting some alteration in the beer act, were all our legislators extensive brewers, and were the great body of brewers and publicans to make declaration that in case the alteration was proposed they would break up the existing government, not even Lord Melbourne's charitable construction of motives could persuade men, with their eyes open, that the interests of the brewers was not infinitely more important

n the estimation of the legislature than the welfare of the country. How is the case altered by having landlords instead of brewers? The alteration of the corn laws, but especially the abolition of them, would, if landlords are to be believed, considerably lower the value of their estates. Well! they announce by this noble duke, that they will consent to no such alteration—and Lord Melbourne, one of the body, says, "I do not charge you, my lords, with that charge which is generally brought against you; I do not charge your lordships with interested feelings or motives." Why, is not every argument used by the landowner drawn from the source of self-interest? "You will depreciate our property—you will lower our rents—you will cause us to contract the limits of our present establishments. Perish manufactures—let agriculture, otherwise landlords, live." Men who employ this language, or what is equivalent to this, may be the wisest, the most disinterested, the most benevolent that human nature can furnish—but then they lay themselves open to grave suspicions. When they declare that they will tolerate no administration which does not continue to give a fictitious value to their estates, they may talk with solemnity about their paramount concern for the nation's prosperity; but let them not complain if they are unable to secure belief. They must expect men who simply avail themselves of common sense to understand that the real object sought is one not far from home.

It may not be amiss, either, to observe the peremptory tone of the announcement. The landlords do not wait to discuss the propriety of a fixed duty. They ask for no proof that such a measure will be beneficial to the suffering masses. They intimate no disposition to consider the bearings of the question upon the great and complicated interests of the country. They care nothing about the pressure of events. They leave no room for the influence of commercial and economical laws, which in the course of their operation may develop the necessity of the change they deprecate. Before the parliament, summoned by her Majesty for the express purpose of deciding this matter, has had time to enter upon its duties, or to entertain one substantive motion, this most modest, most humane, most self-denying, most unimpeachable body of landowners poke in the very eyes and ears of the nation an announcement to the effect, that a fixed duty shall not be allowed, and that her Majesty shall have no government which entertains an idea of such a project. Were these men any other than landlords we should deem their threat a bit of pure, unmixed, and impudent selfishness:—

"But Brutus is an honourable man;
So are they all, all honourable men."

Well! we are glad they have spoken out. This dictum of the Duke of Richmond should be rung in every corner of the land—plastered on the walls of every street. Hear it Englishmen! Let the truth sink down to the bottom of your hearts! Hear it, and ponder, and resolve! You are governed, not by a free constitution, but by landlords. You are governed, not for your own advantage, but for theirs! This is the confession of a high-minded tory peer.

NOTABILIA OF THE LATE DEBATE.

THE House of Commons, whose election sheds such honour upon our representatives, and illustrates with unexampled force the purity and independence of our constituencies, entered last week upon its important functions. We cannot better characterise its first debate than by saying that it was eminently worthy of that dignified body, and worthy of the practices by which its members generally obtained their seats. When we have said thus much we imagine that nobody can misunderstand us; and therefore, without waste of words, we proceed to notice a few features in the discussion.

No one can wade through this long debate without perplexing himself ever and anon with the inquiry "*cui bono?*" What end was it designed to serve? Why was it thus protracted; and why was it not, like that in the House of Lords, brought to a termination on Tuesday night? The question was a simple one—the ultimate issue was well known—no point of delicacy or difficulty was involved. Had it lasted until the end of the session the people would have gleaned nothing serviceable to them out of this wilderness of words. It was a mere question as to which of the two sections of the aristocracy should wield the powers of government; and every one knew that on a division the tories would have the "ayes." But party questions awaken the hottest zeal of our honourable representatives when the most urgent national affairs cannot obtain a hearing. So much sympathy is there between the people and the people's House—so correctly does the pulse of the latter vibrate in unison with that of the former.

We have already cursorily observed upon the facility and *sang froid* with which the whigs transfer the interests of the nation to the hands of their cousins the tories. Anything like a truth-looking and vivid representation of the awful perils to which the country is exposed—anything in the shape of bold and earnest expostulation—any bursts of patriotism or ebullitions of compassionate feeling for the thousands who look up for daily bread, and must henceforth look up in vain—any utterance of faithful warning, any intimations that the voice of the country has been choked and stifled by corruption and intimidation—we look for in vain in the speeches of the leading whigs. No man can rise up from an attentive perusal of this debate with the impression upon his mind that these men are concerned for their measures because they involve the future weal or woe of the nation they have so long governed. The tone, the language, the selection of arguments, the manner—all savour of party, are tintured with love of place. Nothing indicates that the whigs are more attached to their measures than to office—nothing that the welfare of the country affects them more powerfully than

retention of power—nothing that they will be any other in opposition than they were when they occupied the government benches. We see in this protracted discussion a practical commentary upon Lord John Russell's volunteered declaration that "he will not harass her Majesty's government with vexatious opposition."

Another general feature of the debate must strike even a cursory reader. The House, which will practically declare against the principles of free trade, admitted tacitly and in theory the soundness of those principles. Sir Robert Peel declared himself friendly to them, even when in the same breath he covertly revealed his intention of repudiating them. If, then, these principles are so generally recognised as true and as conducive to the prosperity of the country, that men known to hate them dare not openly impugn them, what is the obstacle, the public may well ask, to their immediate legislative adoption? If we are fairly represented, why do not our opinions take effect? There is but one reply. The interests of our legislators and those of the nation at large are at variance. Either we must have a new House of Commons or resign ourselves to certain ruin.

Of the speeches of honourable members individually we cannot afford space for any analysis. Two or three points only demand special notice.

Mr. Cobden in a very effective but somewhat too lengthy speech, was bold enough to refer to the Manchester Conference. He vindicated its character—he shrank not from bearing testimony to the value of its labours. In an atmosphere, probably the least favourable to be found in the country for any serious reference to religion and religious men, he spoke of the 1500 ministers who were "offering up their prayers in their several localities to incline the will of Him who rules princes and potentates, to turn your hearts to justice and mercy." We augur well of the honourable member from this his first essay as a senator of our land—and if we could suppose our voice might reach him, we would earnestly warn him to beware of the meshes of whig policy.

The speech of Mr. Sharman Crawford was manly and straightforward. We hail the re-appearance of this right-minded gentleman on the parliamentary stage.

Mr. Wakley ventured to render himself ridiculous—no uncommon thing by the way—by giving, in the name of the radical body, the most high-flown and extravagant professions of attachment to the throne, and declaring their sincere affection for the established church. Did the honourable member speak for Mr. Roebuck and Sir W. Molesworth? That must be an eminently spiritual institution which commands the veneration of Mr. Wakley. But perhaps he referred to it only in its political aspect. Well, when avowed radicals of the first water, go out of the way to express affection for an institution thoroughly conservative in all its tendencies and all its acts—which lives and moves and has its being in toryism, we take leave to set them down as either ignorant of their own principles or false in their profession of them. Mr. Wakley is just the man whom we may expect one day to tread in the footsteps of Sir Francis Burdett. Were Sir Robert Peel to angle with a baronetey, we would not guarantee that the bait would not be greedily swallowed.

The speech of Mr. O'Connell was evidently delivered under an impression that his auditors had all been steeped in the waters of Lethe. The whigs—the whigs—and nothing but the whigs. Will the hon. member for all Ireland lose patronage by the defeat of his recent favourites? A most forgiving man is Mr. O'Connell, who can so hug in fond embraces the men, every one of whom he has coarsely vilified.

Sir Robert's effort was a great improvement upon the Tamworth exhibition. The former part of his speech is not only powerful, but, we trust, will operate beneficially in regard to the relation between the several powers of Europe. But on the subject of his future policy, mystery and reserve are still predominant. One thing we learn, that he will abide by the sliding scale—and, therefore, we may bid a long farewell to all prospects of free trade.

A SCENE IN THE COMMONS.

The *Times* of Monday last has the following paragraph which we quote without any correction of its evident exaggeration, simply for the purpose of bringing before our readers a description of a circumstance upon which we feel bound to make a brief comment.

"An extraordinary scene occurred in the House of Commons on Saturday during the debate on Mr. Sharman Crawford's radical amendment to the address. It was apparent at an early period of the discussion that the radical section of the House was not at all satisfied with the course which the hon. member for Rochdale had thought proper to take. Mr. Roebuck was seen, during Mr. Crawford's speech, holding a conference with Messrs. Ward, Protheroe, Leader, and Hawes, and Lord Duncan. The hon. member for Bath appeared greatly excited. At one moment he was seen speaking with considerable animation to Mr. Leader, after which the latter gentleman put himself in communication with Mr. Ward. It was clear that something important was in the wind. After Mr. Crawford had resumed his seat, and General Johnson had seconded the amendment, Mr. Roebuck looked significantly at the hon. member for Sheffield. Mr. Ward immediately rose and expressed his determination not to vote for the amendment which had been proposed, as he considered it very ill-timed and impolitic to bring at that moment so important a question before the House, particularly as there were no responsible advisers of the Crown present. He also stated, that it was his intention to give the government about to be formed under the auspices of Sir R. Peel a fair trial. He would not be drawn into a premature consideration of the important question involved in the amendment, and if the hon. member persisted in forcing it upon the House, he (Mr. Ward) would instantly withdraw. Mr. Roebuck followed, and expressed with great warmth and vehemence his concurrence in the view taken by Mr. Ward, and declared that if the hon. member (who had thought proper to act without consulting the wishes of the radical party in the house) pushed his motion to a division, he (Mr. Roebuck) would instantly take up his hat and walk out of the house. This declaration of war excited quite a sensation amongst the members of the movement party. Mr. T. Duncombe, the hon.

member for Finsbury (who sat immediately in front of Mr. Crawford), "looked daggers" at his two radical friends. When Mr. Roebuck had concluded his speech, he took up his hat and, in conjunction with Messrs. Leader, Hawes, Protheroe, and Ward, marched in solemn procession towards the door of the house. Before, however, Mr. Ward could make his escape with his friend Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Wallace the member for Greenock was on his legs, and expressed his determination to vote for the amendment: when he saw the movement of the radicals, he took up his hat and waved it triumphantly in the air, and manifested, by the most ridiculous and grotesque gesticulations (amidst convulsions of laughter from all sides of the house), his delight at the retirement of Mr. Roebuck and his radical friends."

We are at a loss to account for the conduct of Mr. Roebuck and his friends, on any principles honourable to their sincerity and consistency. The reason assigned by them for thus contemptuously giving the go-by to all their political professions, is, of all others, the last we should have anticipated from these men. The occasion selected by Mr. Crawford for placing on record a resolution touching the inefficiency of our representation, was natural and appropriate—the resolution itself full of pith and meaning. What then can be the real motives which elicited from the member for Bath such a petulant repudiation of the course adopted by his friend?

Has he joined the whigs? Does he mean to merge his principles? Or is he offended that any member of the radical party dares to act independently of his leadership? If great truths are to be tossed overboard with a view to the convenience or the caprice of party, then we trust there will always be found men who, like Mr. Crawford, Mr. Wallace, and the rest of this minority, will not hesitate to bring them forward under any and every disadvantage, and thus test the sincerity of men loud in their professions of attachment to liberal opinions.

SUMMARY.

No foreign intelligence of the slightest moment has reached us since our last.

The debate which commenced on Tuesday did not terminate until early on Saturday morning, when the tories gained a majority of ninety-one. This of course led to the immediate resignation of ministers, and Sir R. Peel was sent for by her Majesty and entrusted with the formation of a new cabinet. Nothing certain has yet transpired as to the progress made by the hon. baronet—but the principle members of his administration are known beforehand. Parliament met on Monday to hear ministers announce their doom and adjourned until Monday next, when the new appointments will have been made.

Rumour says that Sir Robert will propose the continuance of the new poor law for another year, take credit for six months, and prorogue parliament until February next. If he does thus trifle with a nation in distress, he may expect an indignant country to hurl him from the pinnacle of his ambition and power. As yet we cannot believe the statement.

The Duchess of Sutherland resigned her appointment as mistress of the robes to her Majesty on Friday last, which resignation the Queen was pleased to accept.

At the cabinet council on Saturday last, at which the whole of the ministers were present, it was determined that the resignation of the ministry should be immediately forwarded to the Queen at Windsor. On the breaking up of the council Viscount Melbourne proceeded to Windsor Castle to acquaint his sovereign with the result of the deliberations of himself and the other members of the administration. Shortly after eight o'clock, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., who was dining with the Earl and Countess de Grey, in St. James's square, received by a royal messenger from Windsor Castle, a summons from her Majesty the Queen, commanding the Right Hon. Baronet's attendance at Windsor Castle on Monday.

We hear that the 24th of September is the day on which Sir Robert Peel proposes to meet the parliament as minister. It is understood that the continuance of the existing poor-law for one year will be proposed; and that a vote of credit for six months will be taken. The parliament will then be prorogued, without taking any of the numerous election petitions into consideration, or attending to any other business. It is also reported that parliament will not re-assemble till February. All this is easy of arrangement; but, or we greatly mistake, the country will be much dissatisfied with such heartless apathy. The distress of the manufacturing districts is likely to increase, and find work for the government of a kind which parliament may be called upon to aid in completing.—*Globe*.

Tuesday's Gazette contains another long list of honours and appointments conferred. The Queen has granted the dignity of a Baronet of the United Kingdom to the following gentlemen, and the heirs-male of their bodies lawfully begotten. Henry Dymoke, of Scrivelsby Court, in the county of Lincoln: Thomas Joseph Trafford, of Trafford Park, in the county palatine of Lancaster; William Lawson, of Brough Hall, in the county of York: Charles Tempest, of Broughton Hall, in the county of York; Andrew Armstrong, of Gallen Priory, in King's County; William Clay, of Fulwell Lodge, in the county of Middlesex; John M'Taggart, of Ardwell, in the county of Wigton; Henry Winston Barron, of Bellevue, in the county of Kilkenny; George Gerard de Hocepied Larpent, of Roehampton, in the county of Surrey; Denis Le Marchant, of Chobham Place, in the county of Surrey; Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, of St. John's Lodge, Regent's Park; in the county of Middlesex, and of the Wick, Brightelmstone, in the county of Sussex; John Easthope, of Fir Grove, in the county of Surrey; John Power, of Roebuck House, in the county of Dublin, and Sampson, in the county of Wexford; Dr. George Le Fevre, Physician to her Majesty's Embassy at the Court of St. Petersburg, has been created a Knight of the United Kingdom, by letters patent; Rear-Admiral Francis Mason, Companion of the Order of the Bath, is made a Knight Commander of the Order.

The Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Gosford, and Mr. Brown, M. P. (Kerry), had interviews with the Marquess of Normanby on Thursday, at the Home-office.

GENERAL POLITICS.

DOMESTIC.

METROPOLITAN.

The annual distribution of prizes to the successful students in the Government School of Design took place on Monday, in one of the spacious apartments occupied by the institution in Somerset-house. There was a numerous attendance of ladies and gentlemen; the walls were hung with models and paintings of natural and artificial subjects; and at one end of the room a platform was erected, where was placed a richly gilt chair, to which, shortly after 12 o'clock, his Royal Highness Prince Albert was conducted by the Right Hon. H. Labouchere, M.P., President of the Board of Trade; Viscount Duncannon, and Lord Portman. Amongst the company present were:—The Bishop of Norwich, Lord Colborne, Sir R. H. Inglis, M.P.; Sir A. W. Calcott, R.A.: Mr. Gladstone, M.P.; Mr. G. Knight, M.P.; Mr. B. Wall, M.P.; Mr. F. Maule, M.P.; Mr. Wyse, M.P.; Mr. Ewart, M.P.; Mr. B. Hawes, M.P.; Mr. Williams, M.P.; Mr. S. Rogers (the poet), Mr. B. Montague, Mr. Etty, R.A.; Mr. Haydon, R.A.; Mr. Papworth, Mr. Gillon, &c.

A numerous and highly respectable meeting was held on Saturday, at the Thatched House Tavern, for the purpose of considering the most appropriate method of doing honour to the memory of that eminent British artist Sir David Wilkie. At half-past two Sir Robert Peel entered the room, amidst loud cheering, and took his seat in the chair. Amongst the company surrounding the Right Hon. Baronet were the Duke of Sutherland, Lord John Russell, Lord Francis Egerton, Lord Mahon, Lord Charles Somerset, Lord Burghersh, Sir James M'Gregor, Sir Alexander Calcott, Sir Peter Laurie, P. M. Stewart, Esq., M.P., G. Rennie, Esq., M.P., B. Bond Cabbell, Esq., T. Phillips, Esq., R.A., the Hon. A. Leslie Melville, &c. A Mr. Jobson attempted to oppose Sir Robert Peel's taking the chair, but he was put down by the meeting. A resolution was passed that a statue be erected preserving the manly and well-remembered exterior of Sir David Wilkie, and expressing with skill and taste the likeness and character of Sir David Wilkie. Mr. George Rennie proposed as an amendment the establishment of a Wilkie premium, for the encouragement of that branch of the art, and Dr. Dibdin seconded it; but not more than a dozen hands were held up for it. A committee was appointed to carry the resolution into effect. The list of subscriptions, which already amount to about 1,000*l.* was then read over. It included the following:—The Duke of Buccleuch, 100*l.*; Sir R. Peel, 50*l.*; Sir W. Knighton, 50*l.*; the Royal Scottish Academy, 105*l.*; Lord Francis Egerton, 20*l.*; the Duke of Sutherland, 25*l.*; Sir Charles Forbes, 20 guineas; Count D'Orsay, 10 guineas; Lord Burghersh, 10*l.*; P. M. Stewart, Esq., 10*l.*; Lord John Russell, 25*l.*

Through the kindness of the managers of the exhibition of Haydon's picture of the Anti-Slavery Convention, and Mr. Catlin, the proprietor of the museum of North American curiosities, at the Egyptian Hall, the children of that excellent charitable institution the Orphan Working School, in the City road, have been gratified with a free admission to both those places, to their infinite enjoyment. We understand that the managers of the Anti-Slavery Exhibition are willing to afford the same gratification to other schools on an application being made to them for this purpose.

On Friday afternoon a public meeting of gentlemen favourable to the establishment of a Refuge for the Destitute Deaf and Dumb, was held at the Crown and Anchor, Strand, the Right Hon. Lord Calthorpe in the chair. W. Simpson, Sir John H. Perry, Bart., H. Daviss, the Rev. Messrs. Driscoll, Sharman, Jones, and others addressed the meeting at great length; and it was resolved to establish such a refuge, where the destitute deaf and dumb shall be taught habits of industry, a knowledge of the sacred volume, and where they may obtain that employment which their natural defects preclude them from obtaining elsewhere. It was stated that in London there were about 1428 deaf mutes, and that the neighbouring counties supply 600 more. The Lord Mayor was elected patron, and a number of Lords, Baronets, and M.P.'s were elected vice-patrons, members of the committee, &c.

On Wednesday morning, at a quarter before seven o'clock, the troops in garrison at Woolwich were marched to the riding-school, where they were formed for the purpose of hearing the sentence of a court-martial, upon Driver George Barker, Royal Horse Artillery, read and carried into effect. The prisoner was found guilty of stealing a piece of sponge from a comrade. He was apparently not more than 17 years of age, but has repeatedly been found guilty of similar offences. He was sentenced to receive 150 lashes, to forfeit all claims to pay while serving and to pension at discharge, and to be discharged with ignominy. The prisoner's shrieks during his punishment were dreadful, and both officers and men were so painfully overcome by the scene that many of them had to retire into the open air.

PROVINCIAL.

There are two candidates for Bradford in the field—Mr. W. Busfield, of Upwood, who represented the borough in the last parliament on whig principles; and Mr. W. Wilberforce, late member for Hull, on the tory side.

A correspondence between the Home Office and Mr. J. E. Lacon, is published, in which the latter has advanced a grave charge against the magistrates of the corporation of Yarmouth. Mr. Lacon asserts that nearly the whole of the Yarmouth police force resigned their offices on the 28th June last, voted for the ministerial candidates as unofficial electors on the 29th, and reaccepted their offices, on the invitation of the corporation, on the 30th; their salaries being at the same time paid as though they were still on duty. Mr. Lacon says that these facts had been admitted in a verbal communication by the chief magistrate. Lord Normanby refused to interfere.

At a special meeting of the Leicester town council on Wednesday last, Mr. William Baines, who was elected during his imprisonment for nonpayment of church rates, took his seat at the council board for the first time.

The ladies of Doncaster have presented Lord Morpeth with a splendid diamond ring with the following inscription:—"To Lord Morpeth. From the Ladies of Doncaster, July 16, 1841. A testimony of moral worth."

Mr. Feargus O'Connor, whose term of imprisonment in York Castle for seditious libel would not have expired till November next, has, in consequence of memorials to the government as to the state of his health, been liberated on entering into recognizances to keep the peace. His liberation took place on Thursday evening at eight o'clock, when he quitted the castle in a cab. Statements have appeared in the papers of his having refused, when informed of the order for his release, to come out at a specified time, and declared that he would choose his own time for leaving; and also of an intended Chartist procession from the castle at his leaving it on Monday next; but we suppose these statements to be unfounded.—*Leeds Mercury*.

This morning a sudden stop is put to field labour. Much rain fell during the night, and there is every appearance of more wet. Our crops are light upon dry land: the wheat crops, perhaps, were never known to suffer more in a short time than they did during the late drought; and the long-continued rain since then has been by no means favourable. Some of the heavier crops are injured, as is sufficiently indicated by their dingy colour. In this neighbourhood a great deal of wheat was sown. The barley crops, light or heavy, are nearly all laid and grown; and as the season has been favourable for young seeds, should it continue wet, barley will scarcely be got at all in some instances.—*Collingham, Aug. 25.*

The weather is still unsettled; we have had a good deal of rain since our last publication, and not one hot scorching day has yet made its appearance. The harvest is progressing slowly; in a great many places the wheat is yet very green, and there is every probability that in addition to a late harvest we shall have a long and lingering one.—*Wiltshire Independent*.

In Worcestershire the crops of wheat and barley are represented as being very heavy and good. The weather there, however, still continues fickle.

An extensive farmer who has just come across the country reports the crops upon the Wolds to be very promising. The wheat crops, though small in the ear, appear very heavy and good. The oats are said to be excessively heavy.—*York Herald*.

The corn crops, it is said, have received no injury from the late continuous rains, and that, should fine weather hold out, they will be secured not only in excellent condition, but that we shall also be blessed with a full average quantity.—*Sussex Advertiser*.

Harvesting has become very general in this neighbourhood, notwithstanding the unfixed state of the weather of late. With respect to the general appearance and probable yield of the wheat crop, there exists much difference of opinion; but we are happy to state those of a favourable nature preponderate.—*Oxford Herald*.

During the present week a great deal of corn has been cut in Yorkshire, and the weather at present is highly favourable to harvest operations.—*Leeds Mercury*.

At Bristol, on Thursday, the Great Western Railway Company held their half-yearly meeting. It was resolved to extend the capital of the company by half a million; and a dividend of 1*½* per cent. was declared payable in proportion to the money paid on the shares.

Liverpool was visited on Tuesday week by an awful storm of thunder and lightning. The spire of St. Martin's-in-the-field was struck by the lightning a few yards from the top, and several very large stones, to the extent of a third of its circumference, driven out, and which, falling on the roof, entered the church. The lightning traversed the spire to its base, where it forced its way out, damaging the masonry so greatly that it is surprising that the whole structure did not fall. The spire of St. Michael's, at a distance of two miles, was struck about the same time, and damaged in a similar manner.

At the Liverpool Assizes William Jenner, aged 57, was indicted for the wilful murder of Mary Jenner his wife, by shooting her with a pistol. The prisoner was respectfully dressed in black. He stooped a good deal, and his face bore the expression of having undergone much mental suffering. Occasionally, when the evidence bore upon the affectionate relationship which subsisted between him and the deceased, his forehead became excessively flushed, the veins swelled almost to bursting, and it seemed to be with great difficulty that he could suppress his tears. The jury gave a verdict of acquittal on the ground of insanity.

IRELAND.

The Great Seal is committed to the Chief Baron, Judge Perrin, and Baron Richards.

The great national banquet to be given in Dublin to Lord Morpeth will take place in the Theatre Royal there on the 14th of September.

The citizens of Limerick assembled on Thursday week, to address Lord Morpeth, "one of the most steadfast and efficient advocates of the rights of the people in parliament, and the only secretary in whose administration the happiness and liberties of Ireland have progressed." In opening the business of the day, Mr. William Roche promised that Lord Morpeth should soon officially revisit Ireland, and then he would do so in the high capacity of Ireland's Viceroy. A resolution was passed inviting him to a public dinner.

The appearance of the crops at a distance is encouraging, but on close observation it will be at once perceived that they have suffered considerably. However the harvest may turn out on the high grounds, it is next to impossible that there will not be almost a general failure on the low lands.—*Kerry Examiner*.—On the whole, the crops throughout this province look tolerably healthy. We have not much fears for the harvest—we trust there will be an abundance for all.—*Ballyshannon Herald*.—We echo the farmers' belief in stating the grain to be much damaged by the frequent rains and want of sunshine. In many fields the ear of wheat is nearly blasted, and will not average more than half a crop. On inquiry, we learn the breadth of land under this crop in the south is even less than we apprehended.—*Limerick Chronicle*.—If we may judge from the specimen we have seen, the crop must be not only a fair average one, but of the very finest quality.—*Waterford Chronicle*.

The Nenagh assizes (North Riding of the county of Tipperary) have proved maiden.—*Tipperary Free Press*.

SCOTLAND.

At the special meeting of the Commission of Assembly of the Scottish church, on Wednesday last, resolutions were passed, reasserting the policy which the majority in the assembly have pursued. The commission resolve to seek a conference with the minority who protested against their proceedings at the previous meeting, to try to induce them to reconsider their present position; and besides "to take measures for bringing the principles and privileges of this church, as well as the dangers which may threaten her, before the Government, the legislature, and the country at large, by deputations, public statements, meetings, and such other methods as may appear expedient." A committee was appointed to carry these resolutions into effect.

In Scotland, where the harvest is at any time much later than in England and Ireland, a few weeks of sunny weather would ripen the crops and ensure a good harvest; but the quantity of grain raised is but as the dust in the balance when weighed against the produce of the two other parts of the kingdom.—*Aberdeen Herald*.

With the exception of a few slight showers, there has been pretty favourable weather of late in Scotland, but the crops, by the preceding bad weather, have suffered considerably.—*Glasgow Paper*.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

APPALING CALAMITY.—From the *New York Paper*, August 10.—Our city, this morning, was thrown into the most intense excitement by the announcement of the burning of the beautiful steam-boat Erie, Captain Titus, which occurred last evening, about nine o'clock, near Dunkirk. By this terrible catastrophe nearly two hundred human beings have suddenly been hurried before the presence of their Maker. Many ladies—some from this city—were on board, only one of whom was saved, by means of a life preserver. Captain Titus, the engineer, and one or two of the crew, are among the saved. The largest portion of the passengers were German emigrants, some of whom had but just arrived in this country. The fire originated from a demijohn of copal varnish, which by some means exploded.

DREADFUL ACCIDENT TO THE HASTINGS MAIL.—On Saturday morning a dreadful accident happened to the Hastings mail. It appears that as the mail was proceeding to London, shortly after passing through Tunbridge-wells, the horses became restive, and set off at full speed. When they came to a turn in the road leading from the Tunbridge-wells into the Maidstone-road, they ran the coach against a post, upsetting it with great violence. The unfortunate driver was thrown off and killed on the spot; the guard was also very seriously injured. The passengers are said to have escaped with a few bruises.

FRIGHTFUL ACCIDENT.—On Friday week, when Mr. Van Amburgh was performing at Worksop to a large assemblage of nearly 1,500 persons, owing to the wetness of the ground, several tiers of seats in the gallery, occupied by about 500 people, shrank and caused the whole to come down with a terrible crash. A scene of indescribable terror and confusion ensued. Persons from the sound parts of the amphitheatre immediately ran to the assistance of those who were screaming for aid among the fallen benches. In a short time they were all extricated from their perilous situation, and it was ascertained that less injury had been sustained than could have been reasonably expected from the frightful nature of the accident. Many persons were considerably bruised and scratched, and one woman had some ribs broken, but fortunately no more serious injuries were sustained.

EFFECTS OF SLIGHT INJURIES ON THE HEAD TO CHILDREN.—An inquest was held on Thursday last at the Blue Anchor, Catherine street, Limehouse, on the body of Jonathan Coxhead, aged one year and eight months. Emma Wilson stated that she was called into the yard by deceased's mother, who said that her child had fallen down two stone steps, which led from the kitchen to the yard. Deceased had received a bruise, apparently a slight one, upon its temple, and as it soon ceased crying, it was not thought necessary to call in a surgeon. At breakfast the following morning deceased appeared to have quite recovered, but in the course of the day fell asleep, or into a kind of stupor, and died.

SINGULAR DEATH.—A short time since as a young man at Wickambreaux was anointing some sheep infected with the foot-rot, his hand, which had a slight scratch on it, became inoculated with the disease. A surgeon sought to remove the foul matter by cutting out the diseased part, but it had taken too deep root in his frame, and after lingering for three weeks, death put an end to his sufferings.—*Canterbury Journal*.

OMNIBUS ROBBERY.—The Rev. Mr. Wilks, a clergyman of Little Hampton, Sussex, while riding in a Hammersmith omnibus on Monday week, was robbed of a Bank warrant for 500*l.*, a check for 10*l.*, and 18 Bank of England notes of 5*l.* each.

AWFUL VISITATION.—On Saturday last Mary Lipscombe, aged 16, living in the service of Mrs. Henson, in the High street, Petersfield, being suspected of having purloined certain articles belonging to her mistress; her box was searched, and a valuable knife and fork, a hymn-book, quantity of Berlin wool, &c. were found; and on being questioned respecting another missing article, she impiously called upon God to "strike her dead" if she knew anything of it, although there subsequently appeared no doubt but she had secreted that also. Mrs. Henson, after a serious admonition, dismissed her from her service. She returned to her friends, who live about three miles from the town, and, awful to relate, in a few hours she was a corpse, having died in excruciating agony early the next morning.—*Sussex Advertiser*.

A NOBLE LORD!—The *Times*' report of the debate on Tuesday contains the following:—"The Earl of Coventry then rose amidst loud cries of 'Question, question.' After silence had been obtained, the noble earl exclaimed in an emphatic tone of voice, 'I am Lord Coventry; a few words from me.' [loud peals of laughter]. The noble earl then made some allusion to King Charles and the revolution, the exact purport of which we could not hear, owing to the confusion arising from the laughter that prevailed in the house. The noble lord continued to state, 'I think the country is in a safe state [loud laughter], and I hope to find it placed in the hands of the Duke of Wellington' [continued laughter]. My lords, I hope I have not detained you.' [laughter, and cries of 'Go on, go on'], amidst which the noble earl sat down."

ANALYSIS OF THE DIVISION ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS.	
Majority for the amendment (tellers included)	362
Minority ditto ditto	271
Pairs 2	4
Absent conservatives	3
Ditto reformers	12
Vacant—Yorkshire, Bradford	2
Double returns—Cardigan, Thetford	2
Return for two places	1
Speaker	1
	658

NEW MEMBERS.—Mr. Bernal, jun., raised successive shouts of laughter by addressing the House as "gentlemen," instead of addressing the Speaker, an error into which Commodore Napier also fell, and of course increased the merriment.

THE OATH OF SUPREMACY.—Sir Valentine Blake, on Monday last, moved for leave to bring in a bill to exempt all members of parliament from the necessity of taking the oath of supremacy as a qualification to sit and vote in parliament, in as full and as ample a manner as persons professing the Roman Catholic religion are exempted.

USURY LAWS.—Notice has been entered upon the order books of the House of Commons by Sir Edward Sugden, that on an early day he will move the appointment of a committee to inquire into the operation of the acts for suspending, in certain cases, the usury laws. He has also given notice of his intention, on Thursday next, the 2nd of September, to move for leave to bring in a bill for the better administration of justice in the House of Lords and in the Privy Council.

IMPORTANT DISCOVERY IN MEDICINE.—A physician of Paris has invented an instrument, called a sphymometer, the property of which is to expose to the eye the action of the pulse, the strength of which it measures, while at the same time it develops the system and all the anomalies. Experience has shown the exactitude and utility of this instrument, which allows the physician to calculate the action of the heart, and extend his experienced assistance in the most difficult cases.

"A FINE OLD ENGLISH GENTLEMAN."—Now this gentleman had various endearing appellations among his intimate friends. By some he was called "a country gentleman of the true school;" by some "a fine old country gentleman;" by some "a sporting gentleman;" by some "a thorough-bred Englishman;" by some "a genuine John Bull;" but they all agreed in one respect, and that was, that it was a pity there were not more like him, and that because there were not, the country was going to rack and ruin every day. He was in the commission of the peace, and could write his name almost legibly; but his greatest qualifications were, that he was more severe with poachers, was a better shot, a harder rider, had better horses, kept better dogs, could eat more solid food, drink more strong wine, go to bed every night more drunk, and get up every more sober, than any man in the county. In knowledge of horseflesh he was almost equal to a farrier, in stable-learning he surpassed his own head groom, and in gluttony not a pig on his estate was a match for him. He had no seat in parliament himself, but he was extremely patriotic, and usually drove his voters up to the poll with his own hands. He was warmly attached to the church, and never appointed to the living in his gift, any but a three-bottle man and a first-rate fox-hunter. He mistrusted the honesty of all poor people who could read and write, and had a secret jealousy of his own wife (a young lady whom he had married for what his friends called "the good old English reason," that her father's property adjoined his own) for possessing those accomplishments in a greater degree than himself.—*Barnaby Rudge.*

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

On Thursday last, the independent chapel at Ryde, Isle of Wight, was re-opened for divine worship. The sermon in the morning was preached by Dr. Bennett, of London; that in the evening by Rev. T. Adkins, of Southampton. The following ministers took part in the services, viz., Rev. Messrs. Spence and Giles, of Newport; Adams, of East End, near Southampton; and Parry, of East Cowes, in the morning; Rev. Messrs. Cousins, of Portsea; Mann, of West Cowes; and Morris, of Portsea, in the evening. The collections amounted to £65. The chapel before its enlargement accommodated 800 persons, it will now seat 1,000. The cost of the enlargement is about £600.—£400. of which has been subscribed.

The Rev. W. Liddell, of Westmancote, Worcestershire, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the baptist church at Rawden, Yorkshire, and will commence his stated labours in September.

A neat chapel was opened for divine worship on the 14th of August, at Sutton-on-Trent, in connexion with the Home Missionary Society, and the Nottinghamshire Association of independent ministers and churches. The Rev. Dr. Allott, of Nottingham, preached in the afternoon, and the Rev. H. L. Adams, of Newark, in the evening, between which services about 150 friends to the cause took tea in the chapel. On the Lord's day following the opening services were continued, and collections were made; the Revs. B. Ash, of Laxton, preached in the afternoon, and J. Moreton, of Tuxford, in the evening.

On Thursday, August 19, the foundation stone of a new Wesleyan chapel was laid at Bourn. The services connected with it excited much interest, and brought together many of the friends of Methodism in that circuit. The stone was laid by the Rev. H. Stevenson, superintendent, after which he gave a very excellent address showing the objects contemplated in the erection of the chapel. At 5 o'clock, about 300 of the friends sat down to tea in the school-room and a commodious booth erected for the purpose. In the evening, an appropriate sermon was delivered by the Rev. E. Sackett, of Alford, to a crowded and respectable audience in the old chapel, which is now very unsuitable for the congregation regularly attending.

The Rev. J. Peggs has removed from Bourn, where he has resided as pastor of the Baptist church for the last seven years. He delivered his farewell discourse on Sunday evening week to a very numerous congregation. The rev. gentleman has been invited to be pastor of the church at Ilkeston, Derbyshire.

The Rev. M. B. Diffey, many years an agent of the Home Missionary Society, was set apart to the pastoral office, over the church and congregation at Westgate chapel, Peterborough, on Tuesday, August 17. The Rev. Timothy Gammidge read the scriptures, and prayed. The Rev. T. Lord, of Wollaston, delivered the introductory discourse, and asked the questions. The Rev. T. Islip, of Stamford, gave the charge. In the evening, the Rev. James Dann, of Nassington, preached to the people.

On Wednesday, the 4th of August, the new Congregational chapel at Fritchley, Derbyshire, was opened for divine worship, when two sermons were preached by the Rev. John Ely, of Leeds. The village was crowded with carriages from various parts of the country. In the evening upwards of one hundred and thirty guests took tea in the chapel; after which speeches were delivered by the Rev. Messrs. Gawthorne, of Belper; Gawthorne, of Derby; Newnes, of Matlock; and Ely, of Leeds. The quarterly meeting of the district association was held on the previous day, when an essay was read by the Rev. D. D. Evans, of Heanor, on the duty of Christians to observe the Lord's Supper. A prayer meeting was held in the evening to supplicate the divine blessing and the outpouring of the Spirit upon the churches generally, and for the infant cause in this place. The cost will not exceed 500*l.* Towards this amount the sum of 300*l.* has already been raised, either in money, material, or work.

The new Sunday-school, in Abbey-street, Bethnal-green, for 500 children of all denominations, is attracting very general observation throughout that populous parish. It is conducted by Mr. Henry Althans, and the system of teaching is generally admired. The school has already been visited by Sir Thomas F. Buxton, Bart., Edward North Buxton, Esq., the Rev. James Sherman, of Surrey chapel, and upwards of 100 masters of various schools in town and country.

On the 14th of July, at its first sitting, the council of the University of New York conferred, by unanimous vote, the degree of D.D., on Rev. James Legge, M.A., President of the Anglo-Chinese College, Malacca; and also on the Rev. Mr. Bridgeman, American missionary.

The 18th anniversary of the independent sabbath school took place at Newark on Monday week, when 850 children were entertained, and on Tuesday, those educated at the national and Sunday schools had also their annual feast.

On Wednesday June 16, a public service was held at Ocho Rios, Jamaica, for the purpose of recognising the Rev. Benjamin Millard as the pastor of the Baptist church and congregation assembling there. The chapel, which accommodates about 900 persons, was filled by 12 o'clock. Suitable addresses were delivered by the Rev. W. Knibb, of Falmouth, the Rev. T. F. Abbott, of St. Ann's Bay, the former pastor of the church, and the Rev. John Clark, of Brown's Town.

On Lord's day morning, the 30th of May, the ordinance of christian baptism was administered, at Oracabessa, Jamaica, by the Rev. David Day and John Dallwell, to 63 persons, upon their profession of "repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." Amongst the above number was John Harris, Esq., clerk of the peace for the parish. In the afternoon the newly-baptized persons were received into church fellowship by Mr. Day. This is the second baptism which has been held at Oracabessa this year, and there are still most encouraging prospects of further increase to this already flourishing church.

BIRTHS.

August 19, at Worlingham Hall, Viscountess ACHESON, of a son and heir.
August 26, in Bryanstone square, the Viscountess HOOD, of a son.
August 21, at Carlton house terrace, the Lady GEORGINA BALFOUR, of a daughter.
August 18, at Brighton, the Lady HARRIET BAILLIE HAMILTON, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

August 10, at Union street chapel, Southwark, by the Rev. JOHN ARUNDEL, Mr. GEORGE LIPSCOMBE, to Miss M. A., third daughter of Mr. T. E. KEMP, Finsbury.
August 19, at York street chapel, Walworth, by the Rev. JOHN ARUNDEL, Mr. HENRY ROBARTS, to Miss CHARLOTTE, second daughter of Mr. B. ABRAHAM, builder, Southwark.

DEATHS.

August 25, THODORE HOOK, Esq., Editor of the *John Bull*.
August 20, at his seat, Hooton, Cheshire, aged 58, Sir THOMAS STANLEY MASSEY STANLEY, Bart.
August 11, at Stoke, Devonshire, the Rev. JOSEPH WILLEY, aged 64, late minister of the Moravian church, Devonport.
August 27, at the residence of the Dowager Countess of SEFTON, Arlington street, Colonel GEORGE BERKELEY MOLYNEUX, brother to the Earl of SEFTON, aged 43.
August 26, at his house in South Audley street, General GASCOYNE, after an illness of one day.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

LONDON GAZETTE.

Friday, August 27.

The following building is certified as a place duly registered for solemnising marriages, pursuant to the act of 6 and 7 Wm. IV., cap. 85:—
Salem chapel, Leeds. George Rawson, jun., superintendent registrar.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

BONNER, JAMES, and GIBBONS, CHARLES, Thame, Oxfordshire, furniture brokers.

BANKRUPTS.

BURGON, THOMAS, Walbrook buildings, London, merchant, to surrender Sept. 6, Oct. 8: solicitor, Mr. Kirkman, 70, King William street, City.

JUBBER, JAMES MORRIS, Oxford, wine merchant, Sept. 17, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Turner and Hensman, Basing lane, London, and Mr. John Looker, Oxford.

LAW, WILLIAM INGHAM, Manchester, chemist, Sept. 16, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Mayhew and Co., 26, Carey street, Lincoln's inn, London, and Messrs. Blackhurst and Son, Preston.

MORRIS, DAVID WILLIAM, Tredegar, Monmouthshire, draper, Sept. 4, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Desborough and Young, 6, Size lane, Bucklersbury, London, and Messrs. Protheroe and Towgood, Newport.

MUIRHEAD, GEORGE, 120, Oxford street, tailor, Sept. 3, Oct. 8: solicitor, Mr. Huson, 34, Old Jewry.

RICHARDSON, WILLIAM, Kingston-upon-Hull, joiner, Sept. 10, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Rosser and Son, 7, Warwick court, Gray's inn, London, and Messrs. England and Shackles, Hull.

THOMPSON, HENRY, Nafferton mills, Yorkshire, corn miller, Sept. 8, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Adlington and Co., 1, Bedford row, London, and Messrs. Taylor and Westmoreland, Wakefield.

TROUGHTON, ELLIS JOHN, 1, St. Michael's alley, Cornhill, merchant, Sept. 23, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Freshfields, New Bank buildings.

WILLIAMS, JOSEPH BAYNTON, Bristol, wholesale ironmonger, Sept. 7, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Hicks and Braikenridge, Bartlett's buildings, Holborn, London, and Mr. James Wellington, Bristol.

WILSON, JAMES LEWIS, and TURNER, WILLIAM ALLEN, Wood street, Cheapside, London, Sept. 3, Oct. 8: solicitors, Messrs. Reed and Shaw, Friday street, Cheapside, London, and Messrs. Sale and Worthington, Manchester.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

BRUCE, GEORGE, Edinburgh, baker, Sept. 1 and 22.

FARQUHAR, ALEXANDER, Peterhead, ironmonger, Sept. 1 and 27,

STUART, ROBERT, Glasgow, bookseller, Sept. 9, Oct. 1.

DIVIDENDS.

Sept. 17, Andrews, Mardon Ash, near Ongar, Essex, schoolmaster—Sept. 18, W. and T. Day, 96, Gracechurch street, City, oilmen—Sept. 24, Viner, jun., Sheffield, coach builder—Sept. 23, Rodgers, Sheffield, licensed victualler—Sept. 22, Drury, Sheffield, timber merchant—Sept. 17, Trafford, Midge inn, Hatton, Lincolnshire, innkeeper—Sept. 17, Wootton, Redbourne, Lincolnshire, coal dealer—Sept. 24, Hicklin, Nottingham, printer—Oct. 5, Nicholson, Cheltenham, brewer—Sept. 21, Taprell, Bristol, grocer—Sept. 20, Shaw, Wakefield, Yorkshire, land surveyor.

CERTIFICATES—September 17.

Scowcroft, Haverfordwest, scrivener—Key, late of 34, Bread street, Cheapside, London, linen draper—Stainthorpe, Hexham, Northumberland, common brewer—Hebblewhite, Liverpool, wine merchant—Chettle, Warminster, Wiltshire, linen draper—Beardsworth, Wrexham, Denbighshire, timber merchant—E. and J. F. Bennett, Canterbury, wine merchants—Crowder, Birmingham, woolstapler.

PARTNERSHIPS DISSOLVED.

G. and G. J. Morant, New Bond street, London, house decorators—Heyworth and Co., Liverpool and Brazil, merchants—Burrow and Co., Lancaster, cotton spinners—Chapman and Targett, Reading, Berkshire, linen drapers—E. and E. Heely, Birmingham, coal dealers—Robinson and Woodgate, Chalton street, Somer's Town, pawnbrokers—Tomlinson and Bennett, 2, Wood street, Cheapside, lace warehousemen—M. and G. Catlin, Blackman street, Southwark, stable keepers—Bidwell and Keymer, Norwich, wholesale drapers—Walton and Brown, 7, King street, New North road, Islington, egg merchants—Hart, of South Frodingham, and Acey, of Preston, Yorkshire, corn merchants—Wilkinson and Co., Manchester, general merchants (so far as regards J. Wilkinson)—C. and S. Bucknill, Rugby, Warwickshire, surgeons—Fox and Co., Birmingham, and Speedwell mills, Edgbaston, wire workers (so far as regards Fox)—Smith and Peers, Liverpool, ship builders—Kendall and Young, Boston street, Old Gravel lane, Middlesex, pump manufacturers—Butter and Corser, Wolverhampton, attorneys—Wells and Co., Sheffield, tool manufacturers (so far as regards Platts)—Fryer and Co., Wimborne Minster, Wareham, Blandford Forum, and Sturminster Newton, Dorsetshire, and of Ringwood, Southampton, and Poole, bankers—Barton and Atkinson, Ulverston, Lancashire, surgeons—Monies and Lloyd, Liverpool, drapers—Dennis and Murrills, 15, Cranbourne street, Leicester square—Garland and Weatherston, 16, Bridgewater square, London, manufacturing goldsmiths—Burch and Son, Upper Clapton, calico printers—Nicholson and Co., King's Arms yard, City, merchants—W and J. Daniell, Bugbrook, Northamptonshire, coal merchants—Kemsley and Co., Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, and Liverpool.

Tuesday, August 31.

The following buildings are certified as places duly registered for solemnising marriages, pursuant to the act 6 and 7 Wm. IV., cap. 85:—

The Wesleyan Methodist chapel, Hunslet, Yorkshire. George Rawson, jun., superintendent registrar.

The Wesleyan chapel, Cappenhorn house, Cornwall. William Davey, superintendent registrar.

INSOLVENT.

WALKER, WILLIAM and JOHN, St. John's square, Clerkenwell, manufacturers of apparatus for heating buildings.

BANKRUPTCY ENLARGED.

HETHERINGTON, JOHN, King's Arms yard, wholesale tea dealer, August 31, November 30.

BANKRUPTCY.

BEALES, THOMAS FREDERICK, and JOHN EDWARD, Manchester, drapers, September 11, October 12: solicitors, Messrs. Taylor, Sharpe, Field and Jackson, Bedford row, London, and Mr. Burdett, Manchester.

BENTALL, HENRY, Cecil street, Strand, wine merchant, September 6, October 12: solicitor, Mr. Austin, Threadneedle street.

DANIEL, CHARLES, Oxford street, jeweller, September 6, October 12: solicitors, Messrs. Newbon and Evans, Wardrobe place, Doctors' commons.

DYSON, ABRAHAM, Sheffield, cutler, September 11, October 12: solicitors, Mr. Wilson Southampton street, Bloomsbury square, London, and Messrs. Wilson and Younge, Sheffield.

JEFFERY, EDWARD, Exeter, builder, September 11, October 12: solicitors, Mr. Kingston, Exeter, and Messrs. Mosely and Channell, Bedford street, Covent garden, London.

NESBITT, ANDREW ABERCROMBIE, Leeds, stuff merchant, September 14, October 19: solicitors, Messrs. Battye, Fisher, and Sudlow, Chancery lane, London, and Mr. Lee, Leeds.

SCOTT, JOHN, Brick-hill-lane, Upper Thames street, London, merchant, September 15, October 12: solicitors, Messrs. Crosby and Compton, Church court, Old Jewry.

WILLIAMSON, JOSHUA, Lombard street, London, merchant, September 16, October 12: solicitors, Messrs. Oliverson and Co., Frederick's place, Old Jewry.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

ROSS, ALEXANDER, late of Forfar, now of Craigs by Falkirk, innkeeper, September 3 and 25.

MORRISON, JOHN GRAY, Craig end, Glasgow, coal dealer, September 6 and 27.

KEAY, ALEXANDER, Murraygate, Dundee, grocer, September 3 and 24.

BROOKS, WILLIAM, St. Leonard's Mills, Lasswade, paper manufacturer, September 6 and 27.

DIVIDENDS.

September 23, Fernyhough, Reading, Berkshire, bookseller—September 23, Cross, Mountnessing, Essex, grocer—September 21, Brookes, New street square, Fetter lane, City, lamp manufacturer—September 21, Perry, Croydon, linen draper—September 24, Whittel, Broad Royd, Yorkshire, woollen and fancy cloth manufacturer—September 23, Parsons, Nottingham, common brewer—September 23, Mellor, MacClosfield, Cheshire, linen draper—September 27, Poole, late of Ryc, Sussex, wine and spirit merchant—September 22, Scudamore, Birmingham, chemist—September 23, Sanders, Ryde, Isle of Wight, builder.

CERTIFICATES—September 21.

Mott, Pall mall, pianoforte maker, and Dean street, Soho, distiller—Lea, jun., Cheshire, tea dealer and banker—Sykes, Leeds, music seller—Burdett, Biddeford, Devonshire, merchant—Feaver, Nether Compton, Dorsetshire, sail cloth manufacturer—Daines, late of Tunstall, Staffordshire, joiner—Stonham, Liverpool, copper merchant.

PARTNERSHIPS DISSOLVED.

Clayton and Co., Middleton-dale colour works, Middleton-dale, Derbyshire, barbitis powder manufacturers—Allardice and Co., Stokesley, Yorkshire, surgeons—Morgan and Gardner, Neath, Glamorganshire, ironfounders—J. and N. H. Pearson, Macclesfield, silk manufacturers—Silver and Bradfield, Royal street, Lambeth, Surrey, opticians—Fooks and Britain, Weymouth, merchants—Heathfield and Cartledge, 5, Addle street, London, commission agents—F. M. H. and F. C. Hodges, Bristol, music sellers (so far as regards F. C. Hodges)—Rawnsley and Co., Bradford, Yorkshire, stone masons, (so far as regards J. Rawnsley and M. Frith)—Mewburn and Ricketts, 189, Hoxton Old Town, Middlesex, tobaccoconists—R. Rostron, Manchester, G. Smith, Drewry Hall, and M. M. Rooker, Bahal, commission merchants—Bolland and Co., Middleton, Lancashire, iron and brass founders—J. and H. Levy, Liverpool, fruit merchants—E. and G. Greer, Ramsgate, Kent, linendrapers—Milstead and Morum, Bromley, Kent, carpenters—Cooke and Pearce, manufacturers of Williams's patent trusses—Adams and Harrison, Preston, Lancashire, tailors—M. and S. Rawlings, Frome, Somersetshire, card makers—Hunt and Henekey, 323, High Holborn, Middlesex, grocers—Gurney and Sutcliffe, Halifax, Yorkshire, retail grocers—Miller and Cradock, Stockton, Durham, sail cloth manufacturers—Jones and Co., Newton, Lancashire, iron founders (so far as regards W. Turner and R. Evans)—Laycock and Waller, 1, St. Mary Abbott's terrace, Kensington, Middlesex, surgeons.

BRITISH FUNDS.

	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.
3 per cent. Consols	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	90	89 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto for Account	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	90	90 $\frac{1}{2}$	90 $\frac{1}{2}$
3 per cents. Reduced	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	90	90 $\frac{1}{2}$
3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cents. Reduced	98 $\frac{1}{2}$	98 $\frac{1}{2}$	99	99	99	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
New 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	98 $\frac{1}{2}$					
Long Annuities	12 $\frac{1}{2}$					
Bank Stock	169	168	168	169	—	169 $\frac{1}{2}$
India Stock	—	—	247	247	—	—
Exchequer Bills	17 pm.	15 pm.	17 pm.	16 pm.	17 pm.	15 pm.
India Bonds, 3 percent.	5 pm.	3 pm.	5 pm.	5 pm.	4 pm.	2 pm.

FOREIGN FUNDS.

Austrian	Mexican
Belgian	Peruvian
Brazilian	Portuguese 5 per cents
Buenos Ayres	Ditto 3 per cents
Columbian	Russian
Danish	Spanish Active
Dutch 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cents	Ditto Passive
Ditto 5 per cents	Ditto Deferred

SHARES.

Railways—				
Birmingham and Derby	52			
Birmingham and Gloucester	60			
Blackwall	15 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Bristol and Exeter	33			
Cheltenham and Gt. Western	21 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Eastern Counties	8 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Edinburgh and Glasgow	38			
Great North of England	—			
Great Western	78 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Ditto New	55 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Ditto Fifths	8 $\frac{1}{2}$			
London and Birmingham	163			
Ditto Quarter Shares	23 $\frac{1}{2}$			

MARKETS.

GRAIN, MARK LANE, August 30.

The supply of English wheat was liberal, and the weather being very fine has caused the trade to be extremely dull. New wheat is 3s. to 4s. per qr., and old 1s. to 2s. per qr. cheaper. Since this day week there has been only a limited business done in bonded wheat, and the decline is 2s. per qr. The duty is likely to be 6s. 8d. this week.

The flour trade is dull, and ship flour 2s. per sack lower, as the Canadian flour being offered free interferes with the sale of English.

The supply of Barley being small, prices are fully supported.

Bans and peas are dull sale, and rather cheaper.

The supplies of oats are moderate, but the fine weather renders the trade dull for them, as well as for other articles, and prices are 6d. to 1s. per qr. cheaper since this day se'nnight.

Wheat, Red New	56 to 66	Malt, Ordinary	48 to 53	Beans, Old	37 to 40
Fine	65 .. 75	Pale	56 .. 58	Harrow	37 .. 41
White	58 .. 70	Peas, Hog	34 .. 38	Oats, Feed	29 .. 34
Fine	67 .. 82	Maple	36 .. 41	Fine	26 .. 29
Rye	34 .. 40	Boilers	37 .. 38	Poland	24 .. 28
Barley	29 .. 32	Beans, Ticks	36 .. 38	Potato	23 .. 27
Malting	31 to 35				

WEEKLY AVERAGE FOR AUGUST 27.	AGGREGATE AVERAGE OF SIX WEEKS.	DUTY ON FOREIGN CORN FOR THE PRESENT WEEK.	
Wheat	74s. 7d.	Wheat	13s. 8d.
Barley	37 0	Barley	10 10
Oats	24 7	Oats	13 3
Rye	38 3	Rye	15 6
Beans	44 3	Beans	8 0
Peas	46 8	Peas	3 6

SEEDS.

There was much less disposition to purchase canaryseed, and the top price obtained did not exceed 100s. per qr. We had a parcel or two of new tares, which sold at 10s. per bushel. Carawayseed was held at 48s. to 52s. per qr. In other articles no alteration took place.

Linseed, English, sowing

THE NONCONFORMIST.

TWO BINS of very rare PORT WINE, one full body and colour, the other tawny, and both of extraordinary high flavour, at 63s. per dozen.

HENEKEY, KISLINGBURY, and CO.

Gray's Inn Wine Establishment, 23, High Holborn.

Note.—Sample bottles may be had at the Sample-room. Price Currents, containing all the varieties of their Stock, forwarded upon application.

EASE AND COMFORT FOR TENDER FEET.

HALL AND CO., Wellington-street, Strand, London, Sole Patentees of the PANNUS CORIUM, or LEATHER CLOTH BOOTS and SHOES for Ladies and Gentlemen. These articles have borne the test and received the approbation of all who have worn them. Such as are troubled with corns, bunions, gout, chilblains, or tenderness of feet from any other cause, will find them the softest and most comfortable ever invented: they never draw the feet or get hard, qualities which strongly recommend them to Merchants and Shippers for warm climates, where they are found easier and more durable than any other kind of shoes: they resemble the finest leather, and are cleaned with common blacking.

The material sold by the yard in any quantity.

Also the much-improved Patent India-Rubber Goloshes are light, durable, and perfectly waterproof: they protect the feet from damp and cold.

Hall and Co.'s Portable Waterproof Dresses claim the attention of all who are exposed to the wet. Ladies' Cardinal Cloaks with hoods, from 18s. Gentlemen's Dresses, comprising Cape, Overalls, and Hood, 21s.; the whole can be carried with convenience in the pocket.

The Shoes or Goloshes can be fitted by sending a shoe, and the waterproof dresses by the height of the figure.

HALL AND CO. beg to inform BOOT and SHOE MAKERS that they can be supplied with any quantity of the Pannus Corium, or Leather Cloth, from one yard and upwards, the cost of which can be sent by Post-office Order.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL, City Road.

THE NEXT HALF-YEARLY ELECTION OF CHILDREN will take place on WEDNESDAY, November 24, 1841.

All Applications for Admission, with the necessary Certificates, must be forwarded to the Secretary on or before the 24th day of September next. Printed Forms of Petition, &c., may be obtained on application at the School any Tuesday or Thursday, between the hours of 10 and 1 o'clock.

Children are eligible from 7 until 11 years of age. All persons becoming Subscribers on the day of Election are entitled to vote immediately.

August, 1841. JOSEPH SOUL, Secretary.

This Institution has admitted, since its establishment, ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND TWO Children, a large portion of whom have been placed out in respectable situations. Subscriptions and Donations will be thankfully received by Henry Waymouth, Esq., the Treasurer, 17, Bryanstone Square; the London Joint Stock Bank, Princes Street, Mansion-house; Messrs. Fuller and Co., Moorgate Street; Messrs. Rogers, Olding, Sharpe and Co., Clement's Lane; the Secretary, at the School, City Road; and Mr. Harrison, the Collector, No. 21, Doris Street, Kennington Cross.

For Bilious, Liver, and Stomach Complaints, Indigestions, Sick Head-ache, &c.

FROUD'S COMPOUND HEPATIC PILLS, an effectual remedy for preventing and removing those distressing diseases to which the LIVER and STOMACH are liable; the symptoms of which are known by the general term of BILIOUS COMPLAINTS, when the patient suffers Pain in the Head, Giddiness, Drowsiness, Dimness of Sight, Acidity and Pain in the Stomach, Redness of Urine, Pains in the Back, Jaundice or Yellowness of the Eyes and Skin, &c. Also, Loss of Appetite, Bitterness and unpleasant Taste in the Mouth, Flatulency or Wind, Heartburn, Restlessness in the Night, a sense of Sinking in the Stomach, Langour, Depression of the Spirits, &c., all which distressing Complaints,

FROUD'S COMPOUND HEPATIC PILLS are in an eminent degree calculated to prevent, and should they be of long standing in the constitution, a steady perseverance in the remedy now offered, will remove. They are not intended as a panacea for every disorder of the body, but those only which are primarily and immediately connected with the Liver and Stomach; and the symptoms above stated, will be found in a greater or less degree in every person labouring under a diseased Liver or Indigestion.

These Pills are gentle and pleasant in their operation, require no confinement, nor alteration of diet, and may be taken with perfect safety by individuals from the age of childhood to grey hairs.—Females also will derive essential benefit from them, as they will regulate and improve the general state of their health.

Prepared only by JAMES FROUD, Druggist, &c., DORCHESTER. Price 1s. 1d. each Box.

None are genuine but those which bear the Proprietor's Signature, "James Froud," on the Government Stamp round each box.

The high estimation in which these Pills are held by the Public, justifies the Proprietor in stating, that Persons afflicted with Bilious Complaints and Disorders of the Stomach and Head, will find in them that remedy which they have hitherto sought in vain from other sources—indeed, they have been known to produce the happiest effects in numberless instances.

LOND N AGENTS:—Messrs. Sutton and Co., 10, Bow Churchyard; Messrs. Barclay and Sons, 95, Farringdon Street; Messrs. Butler and Co., 4, Cheapside; Mr. Sanger, 150, Oxford Street.

COUNTRY AGENTS:—Barling, Weymouth; Beach and Co., Bridport; Marder, Lyne; Wills, Axminster; Porter, Yeovil; Penny, Sherborne; Shipp, Blandford; Galpin, Crewkerne; Pitt, Wareham; Lankaster, Poole; Hitecock, Taunton; Brodie and Co., Salisbury; Rutter and Co., Shaftesbury; Wheaton, Ringwood; Herbert, Wimborne; Wheaton, Exeter; Griffiths, Christchurch; Sharp, Portsmouth; Allnutt, Portsea; Randall, Southampton; Woodward, Bridgewater; Aldridge, Bristol; Barker, Manchester; Ching, Launceston; Thomas, Truro; Williams, Honiton; Toms, Chard; Hillyer, Cowes; Rogers, Newport; Greenfield, Ryde; Thomas, Andover; Williams, Ilminster; Grove, Lympington; Forder, Winchester; Gray, Romsey; Cottle, Basingstoke; Nicholls, Farnham; Penny, Frome; and by all other Patent Medicine venders.

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW for SEPTEMBER is published this day, price 2s. 6d.
CONTENTS.

1. The Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts in England.
2. Tate's History of St. Paul.
3. Miss Sedgwick's Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home.
4. The Biblical Cabinet.
5. Bowden's Life of Gregory the Seventh.
6. The Publication of Intelligence concerning Aborigines.
7. Temperance Societies.
8. Philip's Life of the Rev. John Campbell.
9. The Manchester Anti-corn-Law Conference.

&c. &c.

London: JACKSON and WALFORD, 18, St. Paul's Ch. Yard.

HOMEO PATHY.

WORKS by DR. EPPS.
On ARNICA MONTANA, and its uses in Bruises, Falls, Wounds, Sprains and Dislocations, Excessive Fatigue. 6d.

EPILEPSY and some Nervous Affections, being twenty-two cases treated successfully. 3s.

WHAT IS HOMEO PATHY? 8d.

DOMESTIC HOMEO PATHY. 2s. 6d.

CONSTIPATION CURABLE. 1s. 6d.

Sold by SHERWOOD and Co., 23, Paternoster Row, London; of whom they can be obtained, by order, through any bookseller.

Price One Shilling,
TAIT'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE,

No. XCIII, for SEPTEMBER, 1841, contains—

VIOLET HAMILTON; or, the Talented Family : ch. xxii. and xxiii.—A Garland of Poets: by the late JOHN GALT—Oxonian Ethics: Sewell's Christian Morals—Feast of the Poets for 1841—Are Wages regulated by the Price of Corn?—The Baby—Miss Sedgwick's Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home—Musings in the Wen-politics of the Parks—Literary Register—Poems by the late John Bethune, with a Sketch of his Life, &c.—Political Register—Sir Robert Peel—Tory Fallacies, &c.—Agricul-

culture.

In 4to., price (to early Subscribers) 17s. 6d.

Part VII. of a NEW and IMPROVED EDITION of

JAMIESON'S SCOTTISH DICTIONARY AND SUPPLEMENT.

Edited by JOHN JOHNSTONE.

This New Edition of Dr. Jamieson's National and Standard Work is to be published in EIGHT PARTS; to

form afterwards four handsome volumes in Quarto.

Parts I. to IV. comprise a new and improved edition of the Original Dictionary; edited by JOHN JOHNSTONE. Parts V. to VIII. consist of a new issue of Dr. Jamieson's Supplement to his Dictionary; a work of equal size and value with the Original Dictionary itself.

The Edition has been necessarily limited to 350 copies.

Part VIII. will be published in September; after which the Dictionary and Supplement will be sold in 4 volumes 4to., price £8 8s.

In this improved Edition of Jamieson's Dictionary, all the additional words in the Supplement are incorporated in alphabetical order, and the most popular meaning of each word is briefly given; and the reader is referred to the Supplement for the correction, or for additional information.

The plan thus adopted will often save the reader much unnecessary labour; as, by turning up the Dictionary, he will at once see whether Dr. Jamieson has given the word he is in quest of or not; and if a Supplemental word, the popular explanation in the Dictionary may perhaps suit his present purpose, unless he may wish to consult Jamieson's learned Etymologies and Philological Speculations at length, or to peruse those Dissertations on particular words and phrases, which throw so much light on the Literature, Antiquities, and Customs of Scotland.

In post 8vo., price Six Shillings, Volume III. of

T Y T L E R'S HISTORY OF SCOTLAND. New Edition; containing the Reigns of Robert I. and Robert II.; the Regency of Albany; and the Reign of James I.

Volume IV. will be published on 30th September, and a Volume every alternate month, until the completion of the work, in Eight Volumes.

LORD BROUHAM'S SPEECHES, &c.

Now offered at £1 5s. ready money, or £1 8s. credit.

Handsomely printed in four large volumes, 8vo., under his Lordship's immediate superintendence, and originally published at £2 8s.

THE SPEECHES OF HENRY LORD BROUHAM,

at the Bar and in Parliament, upon Questions relating to Public Rights, Duties, and Interests; with Historical Introductions, and a Critical Dissertation upon the Eloquence of the Ancients.

"This is a work which ought to be possessed by every free-minded man in the British empire who can afford to add any books at all to his literary stores. The smaller the collection, so much the more valuable will be such an addition to it, for it discusses almost all the political, legal, and economical questions the nearest to 'men's business and bosoms,' that have arisen and been mooted within the last forty years."—*Edinburgh Review*.

Second Edition, in royal 18mo., with above forty

Wood Cuts, price 4s. 6d.

THE STEAM-ENGINE; being a popular Description of the Construction and Mode of action of that Engine, as applied to RAISING WATER, MACHINERY, NAVIGATION, RAILWAYS, &c.; with a Sketch of its History, and an Account of the Laws of Heat and Pneumatics, illustrated by a number of Wood Engravings.

By HUGO REID, Lecturer on Chemistry, &c.

"A very admirable little book—scientific, learned, and perfectly lucid."—*Spectator*.

In post 8vo., price 6s.

ARTS AND ARTISANS AT HOME AND ABROAD; with Sketches of the Progress of Foreign Manufactures. By JELLINGER C. SYMONS, Esq., one of the Assistant Commissioners on the Handloom Inquiry; and since deputed by the Government to inquire into the Condition of the Artisan Classes in France, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, &c.

The CHEAP EDITION, designed for general circulation, of

THE POEMS OF EBENEZER ELLIOTT,

the Corn Law Rhymers, in large 8vo., closely printed, and stereotyped, with a Portrait of Mr. Elliott; price Four Shillings. The previous edition was in three volumes, and cost 15s.

WILLIAM TAIT, 107, Prince's Street, Edinburgh;

SIMPKIN and Co. London; and JOHN CUMMING, Dublin.

Orders received by all Booksellers.

THE POLYTECHNIC JOURNAL

for September, No. XXV., price 1s. contains:—Moral Treatment of Disease, or the Metaphysics of Medicine—Kieseritzky, the Chess Player—La Trappe—Some account of Latin and Italian Literature in the Fourteenth Century—The Mammoth Iron Steamer and Mr. Smith's Screw Propeller—Mr. Bain's Electro-Magnetic Printing Telegraph—Proceedings of the Learned Societies of London—Masterman Ready, with ten beautiful Wood-cuts—Reviews and Notices—Meteorological Table for August, &c.—Office, 13, Wellington-street North: and of all booksellers.

The POLYTECHNIC JOURNAL is published on the first of every month, and contains a great variety of valuable, instructive, and entertaining matter.

METHODISM VERSUS TEETOTALISM.

This Day is published, Forty-eight pages 8vo., Price Nine-pence.

THE DESPOTISM OF MODERN WESLEYAN METHODISM DEMONSTRATED, in a Letter addressed to the various Members of the Methodist Societies throughout Great Britain.

By MR. WILLIAM SMALL, of Boston, Lincolnshire. Together with an Account of the Inquisitorial Proceedings of the recent District Meeting at Boston, against Two young Men, Candidates for the Ministry, Members of a Teetotal Society: comprised in Three Letters, by "A Hater of Priestcraft;" also, the other Correspondence relating to the Transaction.

"His censure reached them as he dealt it, And each by shrinking shew'd he felt it."—COWPER. London: SIMPKIN and MARSHALL; and sold by all Booksellers.

Just published, price 2s., **THEOLOGICAL COURSE** (Second Series) on the BOOK OF REVELATION, as illustrative of the History of Religion.

PALMER and SON, Paternoster Row; where may be had FIRST SERIES, on the BOOK OF THE LAW, as illustrative of the Grace of the Gospel.

Also, by the same Author, **CHURCH PRINCIPLES** in their Legitimate Results; or, Essays on the APOCALYPSE, with Illustrations from the Oxford Divines. A New Edition.

Likewise, **THE LETTERS OF A LAYMAN** to the Lord Bishop of Durham, on certain Points of Doctrine hitherto but imperfectly developed.

N.B. These LETTERS contain a full Exhibition of the Doctrinal Errors of the Establishment, as the ESSAYS do of its Errors in Discipline; together forming a complete Analysis of the System.

PRACTICAL EXPOSITIONS.

Edited by the Rev. JAMES SHERMAN, Surrey Chapel.

MANTON ON THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. 7s. 6d.

GREENHILL ON EZEKIEL. 1850. 2s.

ADAMS ON SECOND OF PETER. 1633. 2s.

JENKYN ON JUDE. 1653. 10s. 6d.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

DAILLE ON THE PHILIPPIANS. 1643. 12s. 6d.

DAILLE ON THE COLOSSIANS. 1648. 1 IN ONE VOL.

Shortly will be Published, BURROUGHS, HALL, and REYNOLDS, ON HOSEA.

"They contain a treasure of valuable thought, practically illustrating and applying Scriptural truth to the edification of the Church."—Rev. E. Bickersteth.

"I cannot but rejoice that their writings should be made attainable by every Minister of our Church."—Rev. F. Cunningham.

"We consider the Christian church, and more especially Christian ministers and students preparing for the ministry, under deep obligations to the Rev. James Sherman, for the republication of those valuable expository works, which were bequeathed to posterity by the puritan divines."—E. Henderson, D.D. *Theological Tutor*.—Robert Halley, D.D.

"As there is so little new under the sun, it might often be preferable in this manner to reproduce and republish the actual treasures of literature which lie concealed and neglected, rather than perpetually to increase the number of books, apparently new, but of which the principal materials are already in our possession."—William Stroud, M.D.

"I think you are conferring a great benefit on the rising ministry, as well as on the religious public, in furnishing them with these Expositions in a neat and even elegant form, and at a very reasonable price."—Walter Scott, *Theological Tutor*.

"The present design of reprinting some of the most scarce and valuable Expositions of our old divines in a cheap and accessible form cannot but be entitled to all commendation."—W. B. Cludow, *Classical Tutor*.

"The esteemed minister of Surrey Chapel, the Rev. James Sherman, has with great toil rescued almost from oblivion these valuable specimens of Christian theology of the seventeenth century, which are now presented to the public in a form of great beauty, and at a cost scarcely amounting to a fifth part of the price of the old editions."